THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Redhill Rectory, Rowlands Castle, Hants, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXI JULY, 1930 No. 121

EDITORIAL

Though some weeks have elapsed since the death of Archbishop Davidson, the event is one that we should not like to pass over in silence. For, by common consent, Archbishop Davidson was a great holder of his office; and that means that he has left through it a mark upon history. And one, at least, of the ways in which he did that was by making the office itself, and all that it represented, greater than it was before. There is a sense in which, in regard to England alone, the office could scarcely have become greater than it had always been; though we believe that Archbishop Davidson's work in the creation and conduct of the Church Assembly will be regarded by future historians as a very real enrichment of the scope and meaning of the Primacy. But no such doubt can occur in regard to the development of the œcumenical relations of the office. Whether we turn to his dealings with other Churches, and particularly with the Churches of Serbia and Russia, and remember his indefatigable and disinterested labours on their behalf in times of direst need, or to his association with the ever multiplying dioceses of our own Communion overseas, or to his labours for peace and understanding among the nations, the verdict is the same. Lambeth means more today than at any previous time throughout Christendom, throughout Anglicanism, and throughout the world; and that new significance will not be lost. To Archbishop Davidson more than to any other man is it to be ascribed.

If we ask the secret of this influence, that too is not far to seek: it lay in his character. The reality and simplicity of his own religious faith; his humility and honesty; the sagacity and sympathy which he brought to every problem; his genius for knowing what needed to be known and remembering what needed to be remembered, these were perhaps its most significant features. And they have left an indelible impression on all who knew him.

APOSTLES AND PROPHETS

THE purpose of this paper is to enquire into the nature and functions of those two sets of persons—namely, Apostles and Prophets—who were described by St. Paul as being the foundation on which the Church was built. The enquiry is the more needed, because both terms are widely used today by theologians and others, especially in connection with Reunion, as though neither term presented any difficulty and everyone knew what they meant. It is even suggested that they stand for two kinds of succession, of which the first is represented in the Catholic communions and the second in the Protestant; and the divisions between the two are to be made more tolerable, and the problem of uniting them less insoluble, by finding for both alike a primitive origin in the Church of the first century. It is obvious that, when such admirable motives are at work, ætiology may very easily come to take the place of history; and, indeed, the ætiological spirit could not be more plainly betrayed than in the words from *Alice in Wonderland*—"All are right and all shall have prizes"—which Canon Streeter quotes as the upshot of his recent study of the early Church and its ministries. It is true that this particular dichotomy between Apostle and Prophet is not so important in Canon Streeter's interpretation as in those of the Bishop of Gloucester or Professor N. P. Williams; but all alike seem to take it for granted that we know what an Apostle, and what a Prophet, was. And yet that is an assumption which is surely somewhat gratuitous. If any reader of this article were told that a Prophet was going to visit him tomorrow, would he know what to expect? If Dr. Norwood of the City Temple is to be trusted, he would expect someone like a Nonconformist minister. But there is nothing whatever of the Nonconformist, so far as one can see, about such Christian Prophets as Barnabas, Silas, or the Seer of Patmos. There is clearly some serious confusion of thought here, and it is one that only careful lexicographical and historical work can hope to clear up. The present article is a modest contribution to that end.

The fundamental conception of the Church of the New Testament is that it is the community of the Messiah. So much is involved in our Lord's words to St. Peter after his confession at Cæsarea Philippi (Matt. xvi. 17-19); and the idea forms one of the main themes of St. Peter's public address to the multitude at Pentecost. It is significant also that at Antioch, where the new "way" seems first to have received a name, the word used was not "Jesu-ites" but "Christians," or "people of the Messiah." The same conception dominates

the thought of St. Paul, as when he speaks of the Church as "the Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16), or more explicitly "the body of the Messiah." And it is no less evident in 1 Peter, where the privileged titles of "chosen people," "royal priesthood," "holy nation," are transferred *en bloc* to the Christian Church. This point of the Messianic character of the Church is important for a number of reasons, and explains much that has been most central in later Catholicism. It explains, for instance, the Church's steady insistence upon the rule of faith, for it is faith in the Messiah that gives the Church its significance. It explains also the Catholic emphasis upon the Church's unity; there could no more be a multiplicity of "churches" than a multiplicity of Israels; and the modern usage of the term "churches" in this denominational sense has no warrant whatever in the New Testament. It is important, further, for any right conception of the Ministry, not only because the Ministry exists in and for the Church and is indeed unintelligible without it, but also because the two primary ministries—those of Apostles and of Prophets—are directly connected with the Messianic office.

The picture of the Ministry presented by the New Testament writers is of a diversity of gifts and functions gradually being brought to order under the supervision of the Apostles. The diversity is due partly to the different kinds of spiritual gifts which the outpouring of the Holy Ghost discovered or created; and this is still further complicated by the fact that in different churches different gifts were especially prominent, according as each had need. It is no accident, we may surmise, that the order of ministries which St. Paul mentions when writing to the Ephesians is not the same as that which he had given when writing to the Church of Corinth; and any attempt, therefore, to build any uniform theory of the Ministry upon these passages is beside the mark. The fluidity of St. Paul's language reflects, no doubt, a real fluidity in the facts of the time. All the more impressive, accordingly, are those certainties that emerge: first, that all ministries alike were regarded as due to the grace of the Holy Spirit; secondly, that a peculiar pre-eminence clearly attaches to Apostles and Prophets; and thirdly, that the Apostles claim and exercise a jurisdiction in regard to all other ministries which is *sui generis*.

Apostles*

Though it would not be true to say that the term "apostle" is restricted in the New Testament to the Twelve, the exceptions do no more than prove the rule. The title naturally belonged

* I am much indebted in this section to Dr. Lowther Clarke's essay in the forthcoming volume entitled *Episcopacy Ancient and Modern*.

par excellence to those Twelve whom the Lord Himself had called, sent, and so named (Mk. iii. 14); and it is with them only that we need concern ourselves.

In the Persian period of Jewish history, represented by the two Books of Chronicles, the word *shalach* or "send" became a technical term for the "authorization and appointment of persons with a specific range of jurisdiction (at a distance from the authorizing power) and duty, to act as plenipotentiary representatives."* An interesting use of the word is found in connection with the collection of contributions from Jewish synagogues for the headquarters at Jerusalem—a kind of "Peter's pence"; those charged with the duty were called "congregational apostles." We may well conceive that this usage would have conferred a special importance in St. Paul's eyes upon his own work of collecting "for the poor saints that were in Jerusalem"; for it would have served to commend his apostolate to those who had entered Christianity from Judaism. More significant still is our Lord's choice of the term for the Twelve. For St. Mark's words—"whom also he named apostles" (iii. 14)—seem to leave no doubt that the choice was deliberate. The occasion was a momentous one in the development of the Messiah's work, nothing less indeed than the foundation of the order which was to rule His people. The name He then gave them must clearly be one that would represent His mind and purpose for them and for the Church. We might have expected perhaps that the title "shepherd" would have commended itself to Him. If it did not, it was because "apostle" contained some other or further meaning which He greatly desired to impress on them. And that meaning was the idea of authority and jurisdiction which was inherent in the term.

The Apostles, therefore, were essentially the representatives of the authority and jurisdiction of the Messiah. Their ministry was thus at once both institutional and missionary, because they were formally appointed and sent to spread Christ's message and to build His Church. They were the organs of a concrete and historical sovereignty now established upon earth in the Person of the Messiah; and His ascension into heaven served only to increase their responsibility for the advance of His kingdom. We might sum up the primary functions and characteristics of their office as three:

(1) They are the witnesses to a history—the historical life, death, and resurrection of the Messiah. It is significant that, after Judas's death, the Eleven not only filled his place in the apostolic college, but filled it with one chosen from those

* Vogelstein, quoted by Lowther Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

"who had companied with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among" them from the days of the Lord's Baptism, and who had himself been a witness of His resurrection. Such a deliberate restriction of their choice was natural if the historical fact of the Incarnation was what mattered most, but not otherwise. We can conceive many considerations of tact or expediency which might have suggested a different kind of choice, if they had thought only of how to secure a quick response to their message. But they did in fact lay the whole weight upon witness. For the apostolate represented Palestine—Palestine the scene of Messiah's presence in the flesh and now spreading out to all the peoples of the world. The Twelve were the rulers of His historical Kingdom, the links with its origin, and the guides of its future expansion.

(2) The Apostles were commissioned from above; that is to say, by the Lord Himself. They were entitled, as the election of Matthias shows, to fill vacancies in their number, and, as the appointment of the Seven indicates, to devolve some of their powers upon others. But they were only able to do this because their own authority was transcendent in origin and beyond dispute. There is no trace in the New Testament of their either asking or receiving any commission from the Church they served. So far from being evolved out of the Church to meet the necessities of its life, they were constituted within it, and indeed prior to it, by the definite appointment of the Lord Himself. When St. Paul comes to contend for his claim to be an Apostle, it is on the ground of a similar capacity for witness to Christ, a similar commission from Him to that which was claimed by the Twelve. And the claim of a church or a document or a tradition in the second century to be "apostolic" meant that it stood in a traceable succession through the Twelve to Jesus Christ.

(3) At the same time the Apostles were "sent," and sent on a mission to the world. A careful study of our Lord's resurrection appearances shows that they were as much vocational as evidential; it was then that the Apostles received the fulness of the commission which was to carry them to the furthest bounds of civilization. At the same time the strictly missionary aspect of their office must be kept in proportion. If the ministries of the New Testament are to be divided into two categories, the distinction between itinerary and local is a helpful one, and it would be true to say that on the whole the ministry of the Apostles belongs to the former. But the task of propagating the Gospel does not seem to have ever ousted, or even eclipsed, the more strictly ecclesiastical tasks

of co-ordinating the work done, integrating the new with the old, and supervising the faith and life of the whole body. The Apostles, for instance, did not by any means begin by widespread missionary activity. They were available in Jerusalem to follow up the work of Philip the Evangelist at Samaria, and make sure that the old schism between Samaria and Jewry was not reproduced in the Christian Church; and again to take order with regard to the new problems created by St. Paul's evangelization of the Gentiles. Indeed, it is possible that the settlement reached at the Council in Jerusalem played a decisive part in setting the Apostles free for more prolonged missionary work; for there is no mention of their being in Jerusalem a few years later when St. Paul visited the city for the last time (Acts xxi.).

It is in St. Paul, of course, that this twofold aspect of the apostolic office is best exhibited in all its magnificent scope. Alike in Asia and in Greece we see him preaching the Gospel in cities and districts where no Christian preacher had been before; and the tale of his journeys alone is almost without parallel for enterprise, hardship, and audacity. At the same time, wherever he preaches, he plants the Church; himself appoints presbyters, as in Asia; writes directions for the maintenance of discipline, as at Corinth; gathers the chief pastors of a district for a parting discourse, as at Miletus; makes collection of alms for the poor at Jerusalem; bears daily a burden that far surpasses any bodily suffering, "the care of all the churches." To St. Paul more than to any other man Christianity owes the dissemination of the Gospel in the first century; but to him equally it owes the fact that the Church was taught throughout this expansion to preserve the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

Prophets

Few words are used more loosely in common parlance in the Church today than the word "prophet"; and indeed it has become almost a title of merit to be bestowed on anyone who has something to say that people are glad to hear. The idea, which permeates both the Old Testament and the New, that a prophet may be either false or true, is almost wholly neglected, and the term has become one of indiscriminate praise. For this state of affairs it must be admitted that theologians have something to answer for, so far as New Testament prophecy is concerned. It seems as though the prophets of Israel had so occupied the attention of scholars that they had had no time left over for the study of those of the Christian Church. The only thorough and detailed study of them which

I know in English is contained in three books by my father, the late Dr. E. C. Selwyn;* and, though I often find myself in disagreement with his conclusions, I am glad of this opportunity of drawing attention to the value of his work on the subject. The material used in this paper is mainly that which he collected and classified.

Jewish prophecy combined two elements found originally in separation, and denoted by two different words, *nâbī* and *ro-eh*. *Nabi* was an Arabian rather than a Hebrew word; and the *nebiim* or "prophets" were a feature of religion common to all the Semitic peoples. They were commonly seen in groups, and a fanatical religious frenzy was one of their chief characteristics. It was such a group that Saul joined, to the surprise and perhaps the dismay of his countrymen, after he had been anointed king by Samuel (1 Sam. x.). The enthusiasm of their religion was of an intensely patriotic kind: in modern times the mad mullahs of Somaliland and the dancing dervishes of the Sudan are heirs of their tradition. The other kind of prophecy, denoted by the word *ro-eh*, or "seer," was of a mystical and contemplative type, and is well represented in the early history of Israel by Samuel. Ecstasy and second sight were characteristic of the seer; and he had a reputation for practical insight which made his counsel sought for by many in regard both to public and to private affairs. The predictive element in later prophecy—an element which is far too little recognized by modern theology—belongs to this tradition; and so does the still later apocalyptic.

It is easy to note the fusion of these two elements in the prophets of the classical period; but what is not so easy is to realize the persistence of the prophetic circles which were the background of the great prophets. And yet the evidence is not wanting. The position of Huldah, the prophetess, in the reign of Josiah, is, for instance, most instructive. She is a "religious," a member of a "college" or religious community (2 Kings xxii.), and she is consulted by the king and the priests as soon as the momentous discovery of "the book of the law" has been made. There was, that is to say, a prophetic guild or circle in the very heart of the institutional life of the Jewish Church of that period. And there is nothing to suggest that this was unusual. Both Jeremiah and Ezekiel, we know, came out of priestly circles; while Amos's disclaimer, that he was not the son of a prophet, implies that the prophetic gift often went in families. And when we ask further what the functions

* The books are *The Christian Prophets* (1900); *St. Luke the Prophet* (1901), which is less technical and easier to read; and the posthumous *First Christian Ideas* (1919).

of these prophetic circles were, the answer is surely not far to seek. They nourished a particular form of the spiritual life, marked by pre-eminent devotion, and nourished by the collection and study of the utterances and writings of the prophets. If the scribes were the canonists, the prophets were the theologians of the Jewish revelation. It is precisely such a circle that meets us on the threshold of the Gospel story. We find there the priestly and the prophetic side by side and working in closest harmony. Zacharias was a priest, but we are told that after the birth of his son, he "was filled with the Holy Ghost and prophesied," his utterance being the *Benedictus*. Simeon is not styled a prophet, but all that is told us of him—his conviction that he should see the Lord's Messiah, his waiting "for the consolation of Israel," his coming "by the Spirit" into the temple—shows that he was one. Of Anna we are definitely told that she was "a prophetess" (Luke ii. 36), devoted to the temple, supplementing its regular services by her own "fastings and prayers," and surrounded by others who "looked for redemption in Jerusalem." At the opening of the Christian era, therefore, prophecy was (1) at the very heart of the institutional life of the Jewish Church, (2) marked by special piety and devotion, (3) concentrated on the advent of the Messiah and on the prophecies concerned with him, (4) given to expressing itself in psalmody, (5) a function of women no less than of men.

Now it is obvious that the existence of this tradition of religion has very great importance for the understanding of Christian prophecy proper. The great difference to be observed in the latter is due to the conviction that in Jesus the Messiah has already come. That is the significance of the scene at Pentecost and of St. Peter's interpretation of it. The Holy Ghost or Spirit of the Messiah is now poured out in full measure, and the gift of prophecy correspondingly intensified and extended (Acts ii. 14-36). And that in all the directions already noted:

1. The great outpouring itself takes place at Pentecost and in close association with the feast. Its immediate result was a large number of baptisms, daily meetings in the temple, and daily eucharists in the homes, and an ever-growing concentration of religious life around the Apostles. A similar phenomenon appears later at Antioch, where we are told that the life of the Church centred in certain "prophets and teachers," who "ministered to the Lord" (Acts xiii. 1), a phrase which seems to imply some form of ordered and regular worship. Further, we note that at Antioch fasting and prayer are mentioned as concomitants of the prophetic gift, as in the case

of Anna. The same gift seems to be in St. Paul's mind, when he bids the Ephesians "be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord." We may suspect that the baptismal hymn from which he has quoted a verse or two earlier, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light," was the work of a Prophet; and so doubtless were the beautiful *Odes of Solomon* a generation or two later.

2. That women no less than men were recognized as endued with the prophetic gift is clear from the allusion to the four daughters of Philip the Evangelist (Acts xxi. 9); and in the Apocalypse the Church of Thyatira is warned against the seductions of one who claimed to be "a prophetess." The prophetic tradition was the one element in Judaism where women were reckoned as no less privileged than men; and we may ask whether Christian prophecy may not have made an important contribution to the adoption of the principle of the spiritual equality of the sexes, which differentiated Christianity so sharply from Judaism as a whole.

3. But the primary mark of Christian prophecy was inevitably its preoccupation with the fact and faith of the Messiah. This preoccupation expressed itself in two ways, theological and practical. Theologically, it gave an immense impetus to the study of the ancient Scriptures. It is not indeed too much to say that "the Prophet's function first of all was to search the Scriptures in order to find types of the Messiah and His Kingdom, and to apply them to current events as their fulfilments, and then to deliver their application."* So far as the spoken word was concerned, St. Peter's speeches in Acts ii. and iii. afford an admirable example of this; while on the literary side the Apocalypse, which is avowedly "a prophecy" (Rev. i. 3), is packed full of Old Testament fulfilments. And closely connected with this strictly theological function—a work at once of research and of synthesis—went the task of fortifying the faith of believers against moral temptation and outward persecution. A typical representative of Christian prophecy on this side is to be found in Barnabas, "a good man, and full of the Holy

* *St. Luke the Prophet*, p. 21 and *passim*. My father cites 1 Pet. i. 10-12 in this connection—an obscure passage, on which standard commentators such as Hort and Bigg seem to throw little light. Does προφῆται in v. 10 mean Hebrew prophets, or Christian prophets, or both? The absence of a definite article suggests that both are meant. At any rate, the τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα in v. 11 suggests that that clause, which clearly refers to the O.T. prophets, does not also refer to the subject of the main sentence (προφῆται), for in that case ἑαυτοῖς would have been used. In v. 12 ἑαυτοῖς is used, and refers, I think, to the subject of the main sentence, the point being that the work of the Christian Prophet in discovering O.T. interpretations was not for his own edification so much as for that of the Church, to which these truths were imparted by "evangelists."

Ghost and of faith," who was sent by the Apostles at Jerusalem to strengthen the faith of believers at Antioch. It was after this mission, which included a year of regular teaching, that the name of "Christians" was first given to the Church. So, too, we find two Prophets, Judas and Silas, chosen to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch with the findings of the Council at Jerusalem; and we are told that they "exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them." This aspect of prophecy is well summarized in the word παράκλησις, which is used alike of the expectations of Simeon, of Joses for whom it provided a *soubriquet*, and of the influence at Antioch of those who brought the reply from the Church at Jerusalem. It means more than the "consolation" of our E.V., and signifies that moral strengthening which comes from the presence and guidance of those who are strong in the faith.

Enough has been said to indicate the function of the Christian Prophets in the early Church. They represented to an exceptional degree what might be called "personal religion." There were dangers in the prophetic movement, especially of individualism; and we find St. Paul, in writing to Corinth, laying down rules for the behaviour of Prophets in the congregation, and, in particular, insisting that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (1 Cor. xiv. 32). Similarly, at a later date, we find the writer of the *Didache* laying down rules for Prophets on circuit. But, in the main, Christian prophecy carried the antidote to its own dangers within itself. For it was in its very nature closely dependent upon the elements of authority in the Church; emphatic in its witness to the divine Word in Scripture, whose meaning in relation to Messianic fact and duty it was its business to interpret, and carrying on its work in close association with, and under the direction of, the Apostles. The fervour of its devotion, that is to say, was saved from subjectivism by being controlled by theology, and from schism by its intense belief in the supernatural origin of the Church to which it ministered. It was thus the indispensable complement of the apostolate as the "foundation" of the Church.* While the Apostles represent the historical element in the faith, the Prophets represent the theological; those the administrative, these the experimental; those the backbone, these the arteries, of the Body of Christ.

* I cannot, therefore, quite agree with Dr. Lowther Clarke's statement that a "problem" arose out of "the existence of the prophetic ministry by the side of the regular ministry"—unless we should say today that a problem arises out of the existence of theological schools, fellowships for prayer and study, guilds, and religious communities, side by side with the episcopate and parochial clergy. There has, of course, often been friction between them, but not of such a kind, I think, as to create a "problem."

The Ordering of the Ministry

It is beyond the purpose of the present paper to go into the intricate questions connected with the development of the Christian Ministry in the first century. The chief result of examining the New Testament evidence is to establish the existence of a great variety of ministries in the early Church, between which the links of co-ordination are not so easy to trace. Some conceptions, such as the old Presbyterian doctrine of "ministerial parity," or the Congregational doctrine of "Independency," or the distinction between "institutional" and "charismatic" ministries, have been definitely put out of court; and the more modern distinction between "itinerary" and "local" ministries seems to have little more left in it than that the "presbyterate" was mainly a local ministry. On the other hand, it cannot be disputed that upon this variety there was imposed, by the end of the century or very soon afterwards, a uniformity in regard to Orders which is very striking, and which has endured in the Church ever since. Consideration of the functions of Apostles and Prophets throws, I think, some light upon the process.

In the first age, while eye-witnesses of the Lord's resurrection still survived and while Jerusalem still stood as the natural mother-church of the new religion, the collaboration of Apostles and Prophets could be taken for granted, and presented no problems. The combination of the two elements was, indeed, so far as we can see, a necessity for a religion that was at once historical, rooted in concrete fact, and also living and full of present spiritual experience. The destruction of Jerusalem, however, wrought a decisive change in this position. It meant that a large part of the visible historical roots of Christianity was torn up; the Church seemed to be severed from its origin; and, when to this was added the death of some of the leading Apostles and the scattering of the remainder, there was a very real danger of the whole character of Christianity being changed. The danger was that it might become a form of mystery religion. How pressing this danger was felt to be is plain from the First Epistle of St. John. Here a new note meets us in regard to prophecy. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 John iv. 1). And the test which St. John applies is the historical one, *i.e.*, whether or not a spirit confesses "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." Prophecy, that is to say, was cutting loose from history, and tending to degenerate into a mere subjectivism.

That is the situation which led, and led with comparative

rapidity, to the organization of the Ministry on the lines familiar to us from the second century onwards. The detailed steps by which this organization was completed probably varied in different churches, and the evidence is slender. But, such as it is, it points to a development which was wholly under apostolic sanction, even if not always by direct apostolic provision. And we can be reasonably certain that Prophets contributed no less than Apostles to this development of Episcopacy. It is significant that in the case of Timothy, whose functions appear to have been at least quasi-episcopal, St. Paul mentions "prophecy" along with ordination (1 Tim. i. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6) as contributing to Timothy's jurisdiction. The Prophets had, in fact, precisely that knowledge of Scripture and power of applying its lessons to present circumstances which the Apostles needed to fortify them in the step they were taking and to commend that step to the Church as a whole. Moreover, the greater the danger from "false prophets," the more must the influence of the true Prophets have been thrown upon this side. And the result is the appearance, as the basis and norm of the Christian Ministry, of what is rightly and significantly called "the Historic Episcopate."

The aim of this paper has been a study of terms; but the conclusions may be emphasized as having a special bearing upon problems now before the Church. The first is that the attempt to separate the ministries of Apostles and Prophets, as though the first were found especially in episcopal bodies and the second in non-episcopal bodies, is without any shadow of foundation in the New Testament. They stand for two elements of the Christian religion which are both indispensable and which are always found together in the Church, whenever its life is not manifestly unhealthy or dead. It is easy to point to periods in history when one or the other element has been predominant; and each has had its periods of decadence or disease. The incursion of Hanoverianism into the Church of England, for instance, in the eighteenth century may fairly be said to have involved an inhibition of the prophetic element which found compensation in the movements led by Whitefield and by Wesley; while the loss of the historical element is responsible for the distortion of prophecy which is characteristic of American Protestantism today. But the life of the Church of England, as it is today and has been for the best part of a century, shows the two elements functioning fully and fruitfully together; the Apostolate represented by the great growth of the Anglican episcopate and the building-up of daughter-churches in all parts of the world; Prophecy by the theological and moral teaching of great divines, the develop-

ment of religious communities, and the growing vitality of devotion throughout the whole body of the faithful.

Secondly, it is important to recognize that prophecy is in its true nature opposed to schism. The Prophets of the New Testament were not only orthodox, but the creators of orthodoxy; not only Catholic, but promoters of Catholic unity; not only closely linked with the Apostles, but often "sent" and commissioned by them. That does not mean that the prophetic gift has not been manifested in Nonconformity: the names of many divines and religious leaders occur to mind to show the contrary. But this has nothing whatever to do with the Nonconformist ministry as such. The prophetic gift may be given to laymen or lay-women, but does not *per se* confer authority to perform any office in the Church for which proper jurisdiction is required.* And, conversely, there seems no reason for saying that the Nonconformist ministry is marked by prophetic more than by pastoral gifts; indeed, it is probably true to say that it is chiefly along pastoral lines that its most fruitful work has been done.

The problem of Reunion is not, therefore, one of reconciling an apostolic with a prophetic ministry, for they are already fully reconciled in the rich and varied life and ministries of the Catholic Church. The problem is rather one of reconciling a regular and an irregular ministry, together with the bodies which they severally serve. A similar problem faced the Church in the early centuries in regard not only to the Ministry, but also to the Canon of Scripture and the Rule of Faith. It was solved by the growing recognition of the intrinsic strength and work of the Catholic Order, Scriptures, and Faith. Is there any reason to think that it can be solved otherwise today? E. G. SELWYN.

* This suggests an important clue in regard to the origin of Ordination. The question whether or not, *e.g.*, Prophets were ordained seems to be wrongly framed: the real question was, What functions of ministry in the Church required the special χάρισμα and jurisdiction which the laying-on of hands conveyed? And the answer to this question was not given all at once. For (1), on the one hand, many ministries were interchangeable and overlapped—*e.g.*, Philip, one of the Seven appointed to "serve tables," meets us only a little later as doing the work of an "evangelist" (Acts viii.; *cf.* xxi.). Timothy is encouraged to exercise a similar function, though it is clear that he held an office which included many other functions besides. St. Paul, who is known *par excellence* as "the Apostle," is numbered among the "prophets and teachers" who were in the Church at Antioch; and indeed the Prophet was pre-eminently one whose gifts might be directed to, and combined with, other ministerial functions. And (2) experience was needed to show what functions in the Church required definite jurisdiction for their exercise. The narrative of the Ordination of the Seven suggests that the handling of funds so lavishly being given to the Church was quickly realized to be such a function, while the varied activities of the Seven point to their ministry being not confined to that function. St. Paul's letter to the Corinthians shows the beginnings of the question as to how far public speaking in the congregation needed definite authority. A similar question must have arisen at an early date with regard to the celebration of the Eucharist. The *Didache* and the Ignatian *Epistles* show the two answers that were given, and the undisputed prevalence of the latter answer shows it to have been the more consonant with tradition. As to the routine of worship and pastoral supervision, the Jewish presbyterate offered an obvious model; and we see St. Paul in Asia appointing such local "presbyters" or "overseers" for each church that he founded.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF WORK AND PLAY*

SUMMARY

I. Biblical.

1. The Bible enjoins the duty of work, in order to supply the needs of man.

2. The results of labour, as wealth and other property, belong to God, who supplies the need, the means and materials, the opportunity, and the effects.

3. All possessions are constantly subject to the claims of need, as by right. Man's ownership is a stewardship.

4. The dangers both of wealth and of idleness and sloth are shown in the restraining of the impulse of avarice on the one hand, and the inculcation of industry on the other.

5. The life of the soul is the paramount concern of man, and his temporal needs, estate, and achievements are subordinate to the paramount claim of the spirit.

This teaching was both inherited and assumed by

II. The Primitive Church.

1. The Early Church was an omnicompetent social organism, prescribing for its members their beliefs and conduct as well in things spiritual as in things economic and temporal.

2. The property rights of individuals are relative only, and all such rights are secondary to the claims of the human individual as person.

3. Unfruitful and immoral occupations were forbidden to Christians.

4. Organized and spontaneous benevolence was a duty and obligation.

5. The ascetic temper, involving a depreciation of this world's wealth and a detachment from it, assisted materially in keeping Christians true to their ideals, when these began to sag to the level of outside heathen society.

6. The organization of the Religious Life kept before men's eyes the ancient ideal, when prosperity and growing freedom, fraught with grave dangers, began to change the environment of the Christian in the world.

III. The Established Church.

1. From the middle of the fourth century the Church had to confront an unprecedented condition: Christianity, hitherto aloof from heathen society, had now to take over the direction and guidance of it in things spiritual and ethical.

2. The Church had to study afresh the questions of Work and Play; both had to be redeemed and baptized, and neither the assumptions of men recently become Christian nor their age-long customs and institutions yielded easily to Christian control.

3. The difficulty was enhanced by the inability of the Church easily and quickly to adjust and expand the code of discipline worked out for a

* A paper written for the Anglo-Catholic Summer School of Sociology, to be held at Oxford, July 28-August 1, 1930.

society-within-Society to embrace and refer to the whole scope of the larger group's interests, as by innumerable other obstacles.

4. Labour—hitherto regarded as demeaning and degraded; political and social life—based upon slavery; the cleft between rich and poor; the inherited institutions of amusement and recreation; the whole body of customs, laws, usages—were all grounded in paganism. Inflexible habits of thought and behaviour, rooted in alien precedent, would not easily yield even to a more coherent and tried code of direction than that which the Church actually had.

5. Institutions and organized custom—with reference to Work and Play—gave way only slowly to the regenerative power of the ancient expedient, to the society (now the Religious Life) within Society, and to the social pressure brought to bear by Church leaders, aided by the external circumstances of the early mediæval period.

IV. The Mediæval Church.

1. In his doctrines of Work and Play, St. Thomas gives us the culmination of the teaching of a society finally—if not yet completely—Christianized.

2. Work is not penal in quality; its obligation is both natural and supernatural. His outlook is upon a system of thought fundamentally coherent and essentially characterized by the social and corporate quality of human life.

3. The results of labour—wealth and possessions of whatever sort—are in the custody of their possessors. God is the Owner of all wealth; the supreme political authority holds it; the individual may possess it; but all men have the inalienable right to use it.

4. Work and Play both have essentially a supernatural reference, since they have to do with human activities. By natural law we are to order all our actions virtuously, and inordinateness or irrationality is the enemy of virtue.

5. As between avarice and sloth lies a mean, the industrious and intelligent effort which is the virtue in the worker. Play has also a specific virtue.

6. A golden mean of virtue attaches to both Work and Play, and both are necessary to men.

V. The Modern World.

1. Work has for the present world become primarily the means for the acquisition of wealth, and like the associated modern ideas of wealth and property, is utterly alien to the spirit of Catholicism.

2. We cannot separate our study of Work today from its intimate relationship to the whole economic, social, and political order in which we live.

3. That order, as a whole, and also in part, stands in need of redemption.

4. Work must become creative, and not be animated solely by the motive of acquisition. For this to come to pass, the whole of our modern society must be re-animated by the basic conceptions of the Catholic outlook—as to property, wealth, the State, etc.

5. Play stands in grievous need of redemption—from the curse of

cynical and pessimistic professionalism, and from the indulgence in pleasures as in a drug or as with the fervid intensity of a life-work.

6. Can any real redemption, whether of society as a whole, or of modern Work and Play of themselves, be achieved in any other way than by the Catholic Church's tried method; the organization of a society-within-Society where only the King of King's Writ runs?

I

THERE are few references to Work and still fewer to Play in the devotional literature of the Church. Of the latter there is a charming instance in the hymn for Lauds of Holy Innocents:

> Vos prima Christi victima
> Grex immolatorum tener
> Aram sub ipsam simplices
> Palma et coronis luditis.

Is the Catholic to regard this life as so real and so earnest that he must look forward to Eternity for his recreation and relaxation? Among many of our Fathers in the Faith the idea was often inculcated that our life here be thought of as a kind of Lent: in the *Confessions* St. Augustine speaks of his amusements as a boy as sinful and tainted (ii. 9); when Lancelot Andrewes was at Cambridge as an undergraduate, his biographer tells us, he took little, if any, part in the recreations of his fellow-students (Ottley's *Life*, 1894, p. 12, and see note 2). No early Christian more definitely looked from the present world of misery to that of the future, for true delights, than did George Herbert:

> "... if we rightly measure,
> Man's joy and pleasure
> Rather hereafter than in present is."*

Are both Work and Play under the same condemnation, alike under the shadow of a curse, so that the mood of penitence must dominate them?

In our examination of the Catholic tradition, as presented in the writings of Catholic authors, we must not forget that the Catholic Doctrine of Work and Play presupposes the whole organic nexus of thought and action. At no single point in any survey of teaching may we lose sight of the larger environment of the subject under discussion: the doctrines of God, Man, the Fall, Sin, Salvation, Grace, and the Last Things are always everywhere involved. The whole body of teaching and practice is intimately interrelated—part to whole, and part to part.

We must also keep in mind the sources and factors which contributed to the tradition of belief and conduct which we are

* *Man's Medley*, in Waugh's edition, Oxford, 1913, p. 134.

studying: (1) The Tradition of Faith and Practice—partly written (in the Old and New Testaments) and partly oral (in the customs, usages, and standards of Christian behaviour and the Christian outlook upon life). (2) Christian Ethics—with the early and dominant influence of Stoic ideals, from St. Paul through the Apologists, in such matters as discipline, "indifference" (*apathy*), suspicion of the natural propensities and passions of human nature, awareness of their unruly and turbulent character, and the technique of assuring the ascendancy of the will aided by Grace. (3) The peculiar circumstances which the Church had to meet in the fourth century: the Church, as an omnicompetent social organism, had to deal with unprecedented conditions when, emerging from the age of the persecutions, she had to take into cognizance and control a vast world of political, economic, and social life with its own older, pagan tradition and its alien, heathen culture. (4) The profound significance of the Religious Life in this aspect of Catholic History: we look to its first organized embodiment as to its subsequent revivals as successive representations of the true Catholic ideal, ever bearing witness in word and work to the outlook of normative and primitive Catholicism. (5) The important contribution of classical philosophies—following upon that of Stoicism (which has left permanent impress) came Platonism, and, with the flowering of Scholasticism, Aristotelianism. (6) Finally, the reordering of outlook and behaviour—to which task the Catholic of today must address himself—in a new statement of the Doctrine of Work and Play with reference to a non-religious economic system closely inter-related to a thoroughly secular, modern State.

According to Old Testament teaching, prosperity and piety were related as effect to cause; the promises to Israel always relate to an immediate reward: "that it may be well with thee" (Deut. vi. 18). "For God giveth thee power to get wealth" (Deut. viii. 18), and the wealth thus given—though man was doomed by the judgment of God to labour ("in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," Gen. iii. 19)—was a sign of His special providence: "He will love thee and bless thee, and thy corn, and thy wine and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep" (Deut. vii. 13). Yet the danger, always imminent, was that in times of prosperity "thine heart be lifted up and thou forget God" (Deut. viii. 14) and "say in thine heart, My power and the might of mine hand hath gotten me this wealth" (*ibid.*, v. 17). Hence came the emphasis of prophetic teaching that prosperity was not a sure and certain sign of God's approval on man's acts, for much wealth was ill-

gotten and many wealthy refused to share their wealth with their poorer brethren. (*Cf.* Amos iv. 1, v. 11; Hosea iv. 1 ff., vi. 6, xii. 7; Mal. iii. 5, xii. 7, etc.) The essence of religion was, according to Micah, "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God" (vi. 8). The great ideal so far as concerns the use of earnings and of acquired wealth is expressed in Isaiah lviii. 7: "to deal thy bread to the hungry, and to bring the cast-out poor to thy house, to cover the naked, . . . and not hide thyself from thine own flesh," (which passage, by the way, serves as the Lenten *Little Chapter* for None in the Office of the Western Church).

The full recognition that all man's wealth is of God and belongs essentially to Him is clearly brought out in the splendid passage where David blesses God for His gifts at the Dedication of the Temple (1 Chron. xxix.). The ideas which here emerge are: blessing God for His bounty, expressing thanks to Him, the recognition that "all things come of Thee and of Thine own have we given Thee" (xxix. 14), and the act of corporate thanksgiving to God—sacrifice, and a great communal sacrificial meal (xxix. 20-22). In this conception of the significance of the "Blessing" or "Thanksgiving" lie latent the whole cycle of developed ideas of Rabbinic Judaism, as well as the fixed form of the *B'rakha* or Blessing. According to the Rabbis, God is the Owner and Possessor, as Creator and Sustainer, of all that is; His Bounty He bestows on man; and man, in using what God has given him power to obtain, must acknowledge and recognize the Giver before using the gift, else were it robbery, sacrilege, and profanation to partake or use aught of that which God has given. What God gives man can receive and accept, only when he acknowledges and expresses his thanks for the gift.

For the normative thought of the N.T. regarding work, wealth, and the duty of sharing it, we have the axiom: "The labourer is worthy of his hire" (St. Matt. x. 10; St. Luke x. 7; 1 Tim. v. 18), dominical warnings as to the grave dangers of wealth (St. Matt. xix. 21-26; St. Mark x. 21-27; St. Luke xviii. 22-27; St. Luke viii. 14, etc.), echoed by suspicion regarding the deleterious effects of wealth on the soul. In other N.T. writers (*e.g.*, St. James ii. 2 ff., v. 1 ff.; 1 Tim. vi. 17; Rev. vi. 15, etc.); and the Pauline example and exhortation (*cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 8) to his converts: "Study . . . to work with your own hands as we commanded you, that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing" (1 Thess. iv. 11-12), "for if any would not work, neither should he eat" (2 Thess. iv. 10). The obligation of sharing one's goods with the needy is inculcated everywhere in the N.T. and needs no special reference. All that was done or said

was to be done in the name of the Lord Jesus, with expression of thanks to God (*cf.* Col. iii. 17).

As normative to early Christian teaching and practice we may set down certain Scriptural principles: (1) The duty of work was incumbent upon man in order (*a*) to supply the means of livelihood—food, shelter, raiment—and (*b*) to give by sharing with the needy, the poor, and the helpless. (2) Work, while regarded as a consequence of the Fall, never had a purely penal character in Judaism or in early Christianity—the iterated emphasis on God's "working" in Creation and sustaining the Universe (*cf.* the Johannine phrase, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," v. 17), and the divine injunction in the fourth Commandment relieved labour of the onus of a curse and bane. (3) The results of man's work in wealth or property belonged as by title to God alone, and He was personally the Giver of "every good gift" (for *goods* are in their essence "good"): man had the custody, care, and right to use it as God's steward. (4) Possession of wealth and riches both involved responsibilities and obligations and incurred dangers, for man's interests may be perversely concentrated on their amassment and possession, to the neglect of higher obligations—God's and his neighbour's claims on them and him ("Take heed and beware of all covetousness, for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of his possessions," St. Luke xii. 15; *cf.* other denunciations of covetousness: Mark xvi. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 10; 2 Tim. iii. 2; Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. ix. 5; Eph. iv. 19; v. 3; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 3, 14, etc.), and covetousness is reckoned a mortal sin. (5) In the actual practice of early Christianity we have the community of goods in Acts iv. 32-v. 11. Among the people here represented, there seems to have been: renunciation of claim upon their own property, the pooling of all resources, redistribution, and management of the combined joint possessions (in the form of money) by the Apostles. The sin of Ananias may have consisted either in the refusal to recognize the "all-or-nothing" quality of the Christian vocation and obligation, or else in the deceit he practised in pretending to give all while holding back a portion for his own private use, thus lying to the Holy Spirit.

II

In the early Church, while we lack any concrete formulation as to its teaching with regard to Work and Play, there are many indications of the sense of obligation of the former and few traces of any indulgence in the latter. Typical instances which may illustrate the Church's view of work and the practices of

Christians which relate to recreational activities, may be drawn from the literature of the first two centuries.

The picture we have of the Church of the *Didache* yields: a community of hard-working, frugal people, generous in giving (or possibly not so generous as the writer would have them!), forswearing the world and its ways, and living a life different and independent in all respects possible—in ideals, conduct, and social intercourse—from that of the world about them. The believer is told, "Of whatsoever thou hast gained by thy hands thou shalt give a ransom for thy sins" (iv. 6). A traveller is to be put up freely for two or three days. If "he wish to settle among you and has a craft, let him work for his bread. If he have no craft, provide for him according to your understanding, so that no man shall live among you in idleness because he is a Christian" (xii. 2-4). The Christian is to give to him who asks and not to refuse (i. 5, *cf.* St. Luke vi. 30). "Be not one who stretches out hands to receive but shuts them when it comes to giving." "Thou shalt not turn away the needy, but shalt share everything with thy brother, and shalt not say it is thine own, for if ye are sharers in the imperishable, how much more in the things which perish?" (iv. 5, 8; parallels in Barnabas i. 8-11). The "Way of Death" includes: lack of mercy for the poor, "not working for him who is oppressed with toil, turning away from the needy" (v. 2). Almsgiving, an atonement for sin (iv. 6), as St. Polycarp says, "delivers from death" (to the Philippians x. 2). Hard work is of obligation. The author of *Barnabas* writes against those who "do not know how to gain their food by their labour and sweat, but plunder other people's property" (x. 4)

The disbursement of the alms of the Fellowship came soon to be one of the functions of the ecclesiastics. Hence the peril of covetousness for such officials. In the *Didache* the firstfruits of the wine-press, of oxen, sheep, and grain, were given to the teacher (who, "like the workman is worthy of his food," xiii. 12) and the "prophet," or else to the poor (xiii. 3-4). Bishops and deacons must not be "lovers of money" (xv. 1; *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 3). St. Polycarp's allusion to a former presbyter, Valens, suggests that his sin was avarice (*Phil.* ii. 1), and he enjoins that widows and deacons be not "lovers of money" (*ibid.*, iv. 3, v. 2). Indiscriminate giving is frowned upon in *Did.* i. 6 (*cf.* Resch, *Agrapha*, pp. 91 ff., for parallels), though in the *Shepherd of Hermas* the believer is told to "do good, and of all the toils which God gives to you, give in simplicity to all who need, not doubting as to whom you shall give and to whom not. Give to all, for to all God wishes gifts to be made of His own bounties" (*Mand.* ii. 4).

This type of Fellowship—self contained, independent, aloof from the contaminations of the heathen world and its ways—as we know of it in the literature of the early second century, soon developed problems, both practical and theoretical, which it was called upon to solve. Heresy, for example, was conspicuous as well for its wrong doctrine as for its practical falling away from the Christian ideal: "For Love [the heretics] have no care—none for the widow, none for the orphan, none for the distressed, none for the afflicted, for the prisoner, or for him released from prison, none for the hungry or thirsty" (St. Ignatius, *To the Smyrnæans*, vi. 2). Apparently slaves were "set free at the Church's expense" (*ibid.*, *To Polycarp*, iv. 3). Before the end of the first century, Clement could write: "Many among ourselves have given themselves to bondage in order to ransom others. Many have given themselves to slavery and with the price have provided food for others (1 Clem. lv. 2). Dr. Bartlet's words apply aptly to this stage of Christian thought: "Two things are axiomatic: the incomparable value of persons as compared with property, and the purely relative property rights of any individual, not only as compared with God's absolute rights as Producer and Owner, both of all things and all persons, but also as compared with the paramount human or derivative rights of society" (in *Property: Its Duties and Rights*, N.Y., 1922, p. 102).

Among other problems generated within the world of the early centuries were those connected with the growing wealth of Christians. That this was the case is clear from the incidental references of the *Apologies*, *Acts of Martyrs*, and the like (on the apartness and aloofness of Christians and the other causes or pretexts for the persecutions, *cf.* Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*, Paris, 1911, *passim* and especially pp. xxv. ff.). Melito of Sardis accuses "the shameless informers and coveters of the property of others . . . who openly carried on robbery by day and night." Athenagoras, seven years later (*c.* 177), speaks of the "plundering" of the Christians, and says that the persecution did "not aim merely at our property." In the *Acta St. Apolloni* (of about 180-185), the Christians say: "Moreover we do not resent having our goods and possessions taken from us" (in Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*, p. 46). The Edict of Milan in 313 orders restoration of property, goods, and possessions to Christian Churches and individuals (§§ 7-9), and Canon 11 of Nicæa suggests that spoliation was a motive animating the persecutions. When society oppresses and persecutes a minority group in its midst whose adherents are given to industry, frugality, and thrift, and are bound together in mutual help and aid, the persecuted minority will

either be destroyed or else become rich—*e.g.*, the Jews in Europe in the Middle Ages, the Armenians in Turkey, and the Quakers in Europe and America.

The growing prosperity of Christians, who were neither suppressed nor destroyed by persecution, brought about a further temptation to clerics. In the community of St. Hippolytus, on which his *Apostolic Tradition* (*cf.* Dom John Connolly, *The So-Called Egyptian Church Order*, Cambridge, 1916, Appendix B, pp. 175-194 for text) gives us so much light, the Bishop and other clergy have functions beyond those connected with the Liturgy, prayers, instruction, and the ordinary pastoral obligations; besides these, the care of the confessors, superintendence of all instructions, scrutiny of the candidates for the catechumenate and baptism, presiding at both private and congregational suppers, blessing and offering the First-fruits (comestibles, flowers, etc.), superintending the burial of the dead and the sustentation of the grave-diggers, and all charities and benevolences. A collection was made monthly "for feeding and burying the poor, for orphan boys and girls, old men confined to their homes, the ship-wrecked, those in mines, in the islands, or in prisons—who all become the nurslings of the Faith" (Tertullian, *Apol.* 39). Such sums required adequate administration. In the times when the size of the communities allowed of it, clerics undoubtedly worked at trades (as did the Rabbis), but after the turn of the third century—as the churches grew in size and number, and the duties of the clergy increased, as financial agents and bursars of the congregation having so much to do as to be prevented from gainful occupations—we find them severely indicted by St. Cyprian. He writes of the "Long Peace" (the first half of the third century):

> "Everyone was applying himself to the increase of wealth, and forgetful as well of the example of believers' conduct during the days of the Apostles, as of their own proper conduct in any age, they gave themselves over with insatiable desire for gain to the multiplying of possessions. . . . Numerous Bishops . . . despising their sacred calling, gave themselves to secular occupations, relinquished their chair, and were wont to hunt the markets for business profits; tried to amass large amounts of money, while within the church were their brethren in starvation; took possession of estates by fraud, and multiplied their gains by accumulated usuries" (*de lapsis*, 6; *in CSEL.* iii. 1, pp. 240-241).

The nineteenth Canon of Elvira (300) prohibits clergy from going into trade or business, suggesting either that they use an agent or confine their business operations to their own province. The twentieth Canon forbids clerical usury, and seventeenth Nicæa is of a similar tenor. The blackest indict-

ment of clerical greed comes from Julian the Apostate. Writing to the people of Bostra (362), he says that the clergy are always on the watch for money, "always seeking legacies, embezzling estates, appropriating everything to themselves" (*Epist.* 52; in *Opera*, ed. Teubner, 1876, p. 437). Elsewhere he grudgingly admits certain Christian virtues: "their humanity to strangers, their care in burying the dead," "relieving their own poor as well as ours" (*Epist.* 49; *ibid.*, pp. 429-430); and they were "devoted to philanthropy" and "hospitality" (*Frag. Epist.*, *ibid.*, p. 305). Clerical avarice was frequently the subject of legislation; in 370 clerical legacy-hunting was denounced (*Cod. Theod.*, xvi., ii. 26), and Hippo in 393 (Canon 22) had again to prohibit clerical "usury" (*cf.* St. Jerome, *Epist.* 52, 6; Migne, *P.L.*, 23, 532).

The ascetic temper, as a potent factor in the Church's verdict on men's occupations, is expressed and manifested in almost all the early literature. The natural disposition of man is, at least, suspect, and his normal tastes and proclivities demand restraint, control, guidance, and repression. As the soul, hateful to the flesh, arouses its opposition "because it is prevented from indulging in its pleasures, so the world . . . hates the Christians because they set themselves against its pleasures"; "What the soul is to the body, Christians are in the world" (*Epistle to Diognetus*, vi. 5, 1; *cf.* also the magnificent passage in the preceding chapter). They "never visit the spectacles, never take part in processions, and never attend public banquets" (Minucius Felix, *Octavius*). We have to this day, in the renunciation of "pomps" at Baptism, the perpetual memorial of the attitude of early Christianity to the pagan processions—a dangerous seduction and probably salacious temptation to our fathers of the early centuries. St. Apollonius speaks of the mortification of desires by the Christians, who "have no part in dissolute desires nor impure sights" (*Acta*, § 23, in Conybeare, *op. cit.*, p. 45). An almost Stoic discipline of the passions and natural propensities of man was the ideal of St. Clement of Alexandria (*cf. Strom.* VI. xiii. 105; VII. xv. 91). Of these tendencies of the natural temper, sloth and avarice needed special watching, lest they betray the believer. Christianity set the claim of religion on man's every activity and on all of his occupations. She did not confine her instructions to general principles, for in the community represented by Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* for example, she had in no sense abrogated her functions as the instructress and mistress of her children's lives. The Christian view of the necessity of Work for all is clearly suggested by the list of occupations which those who desired to be admitted catechumens had to give up. The

list embraces non-productive, unfruitful, or immoral livelihood, and includes: pandering, making images or pictures, occupations connected with the Circus, the work of those "who teach children the work of this world" (this class was tolerated under necessity), work connected with idolatrous sacrifices, teaching hunting, or actually hunting, driving horses, teaching fighting or war, military service, star-gazing, magic, official positions (such as that of magistrate, chief of prefects, wearers of the imperial purple), soothsaying, making potions, etc.

Most obviously the object of labour—regarded as a duty incumbent upon all who did not possess the means of living without it—was primarily that of sustaining life by supplying food, shelter, clothing, and the like, for the individual and those for whom he was responsible. So little is this emphasized, that save for the second object of work and labour, it might pass unrecognized (*cf.* I Clem. xxxviii. 2). This second object is the supplying of the needs of others. All early Christian literature abounds in illustrations of the deep hold of this principle in the actual practice of the Christian life. First and foremost, there is the *agape* or "love feast," on which Keating's essay has collected most of the relevant material. In the *Apostolic Tradition* of St. Hippolytus, the conflated text gives us two, if not three, forms of its observance: one in which the individual might entertain his poorer brethren in his own home, either there to consume the food and drink his bounty had provided, or else to take the comestibles to their own houses (*cf.* Connolly, *op. cit.*, Statute 36, pp. 187-188).

Another form was a kind of congregational supper (of great interest liturgically, "The Service of the Lighting of the Lamp at the Supper of the Congregation," *ibid.*, pp. 188-189). A possible variant was the private assembling for a meal in the church, under the eye of the Bishop (*ibid.*, Statute 36, p. 187). By these means, Christianity consecrated the commonplace—the consumption of food and drink—lifted social intercourse into the domain of the sacramental, reversed the roles of the recipients of "doles" and "charity" (who were regarded as guests), removing any stigma attaching to them, and sanctified social life and recreational activity. It is not without reason that to Lietzmann (*Messe und Herrenmahl*, Bonn, 1926) this Christian love-feast, being so like a sacramental meal, is thought of as a variant of the very Eucharist itself. As an institution it survived for centuries in Christian practice, until it had outgrown its usefulness.* The early literature abounds

* *Cf.* evidence for middle fourth century, Canon 11 of Gangra: the *agape* where "for the honour of our Lord men invite their brethren" (Mansi, *Concilia* ii., 1097), is not to be condemned.

with instances voicing the conviction that possession of the means of life, whether by earning or other income, involves the obligation of sharing with the brethren. Thus the *Shepherd of Hermas*: "Instead of fields," he urges the well-to-do, "buy ye souls in distress, and protect widows and orphans. . . . For to this end the Sovereign Master enriched you, that ye might perform these services for Him." "To know of [others' misfortunes] and not to rescue them is to be guilty of their blood" (*Sim.* i. 5, 8; x. 14, 2). In *Quis dives salvetur?* Clement of Alexandria severely handles the wealthy (*cf.* iii. 12): "He who holds possessions as God's gifts, both ministering them for God the Giver, unto man's salvation, and knowing that he possesses them for the brethren's sake rather than his own . . . not being a slave of what he possesses and not carrying them about in his soul . . .—such a one is 'poor in spirit'" (*ibid.*, iii. 16). There is no place for one "going on trying to increase without limit, ever on the lookout for more" (*ibid.*, iii. 12; *cf.* iii. 27, etc.). "We who mingle in mind and soul have no hesitation as to fellowship in property," writes Tertullian (*Apology*, 39).

The early Christian view of the results of labour—*i.e.*, property—is well presented by Lactantius. There are two poles of his thought—(*a*) *equality* in the enjoyment of God's bounty, and (*b*) *justice* in the claims of the necessitous on those who have more than enough for their own needs. "Justice" comprises *pietas* (the Godward aspect, vi. 9) and *æquitas* (all men *ought* to be "equally matched"=*pares*), which distributive justice is the peculiar province of *humanitas*. Men are not to "shut up the fruits of the earth produced by them, or brood in solitude over their stored-up possessions, but are to admit the poor to share" what God has provided and their effort has obtained (v. 5). Above all, what is "rendered to man is rendered to God, because man is God's image" (vi. 10). Opportunity spells obligation; the need of man, and power and opportunity to satisfy this need, imply the duty to do so.

Early Christianity recognized the duty and obligation of work and labour, in order to secure the means of life and in order to provide by toil or its results for the needy. Sharing was the dominant note in a religion essentially corporate. The Body of Christ was made of individual men, who found themselves only in membership with It and fellowship with each other. A strongly ascetic tone marks early Christianity; penitence colours the toil of labour, and suspicion of motive with regard to amassing the results of man's work dictates a strenuous effort to restrain the acquisitive instinct. In direct proportion as prosperity accompanied the efforts of Christians, this latter

emphasis becomes prominent. In direct proportion to the removal of disabilities surrounding the practice of Christianity, labour came to be despised and degraded to the lower and non-Christian level, but toil and manual labour were lifted to an exalted level in the organization and life of the Religious Communities (see St. Jerome on the Pachomian Rule and its practice, *Opera*, iii. 55, *in reg. S. Pachomii* 6; in *P.L.* xxiii. 64). A clear call had come for the redemption of labour from the scornful and supercilious verdict of prosperous Christians. Very illuminating in this connection is the attitude of the Church to slavery.*

With peace and prosperity, the Christian tended to lose the poignant sense that he was a stranger and sojourner in this world. The progressive establishment of Christianity dulled the sharp edge of the Christian conviction that this life was but an ante-room to that hereafter. The believer began to make himself at home in this world, where for centuries circumstances had borne on him the realization of the truth that he was far from home—which fact he might not forget even if he would. The Religious Life, now formally and self-consciously a thing apart from ordinary living, saved the conscience of the Christian by re-presenting the old ideals, and re-applying the Christian principle of work. If with the fourth century the Church might be thought to have conquered the world, it is equally true that the world was in a fair way to conquer the Church.

III

In two respects at least is the transition over into a new relationship manifest: Christianity had to cope with the problems of work and play afresh. The Church was driven to think out her policy, and direct the activities of men—many of whom were only nominally devoted to her ideals—in a situation for which her previous history offered no precedent. Unruly passions and propensities, long disciplined within the intimate life of coherent and homogeneous minority groups, and controlled by social pressure and concrete legislation, were now released to play in a larger area not so directly subject either to scrutiny or control. The mediæval ideals of the East and the

* See P. Allard, *Les esclaves chrétiens depuis les premiers temps de l'église . . .*, Paris, 1914. Later, in the early fourth century, masters who maltreat slaves are to be excommunicated, while an almost Utopian regulation limits their work-days to five in each week, with a generous list of holy-days on which no toil was to be done (*cf. Apostolic Constitutions*, iv. 6, 12; viii. 37). Constantine, in 321, had ruled that "judges, city-people, and craftsmen were to rest" on Sundays, while farm-work could still be carried on (*C. J. C.* 11; Kruger's ed., p. 127).

West, of Justinian and the Holy Roman Empire, shared one common outlook: the whole of life was to be made and directed by Christian ideals and principles. In neither point of view was there any infrinsic separation of secular and religious, of natural and supernatural; for while these terms are convenient, they do not imply contrasts and categories in opposition one to the other. On the whole, the Eastern programme was built on too great an optimism with regard to human nature; and that of the West—strongly influenced by St. Augustine—more sophisticated and pragmatic, showed a deep suspicion, if not pessimism, with regard to the propensities of man. In brief—to fall back on the imagery of surgery—"adhesions" had occurred; Christian men had now to be broken away afresh from what they had in the earlier days no temptation or encouragement to cleave to—this world and its ways.

Whereas the sober and restraining instinct of the primitive Christian tradition found all joy, delight, and recreative power in the things of the Faith, after the Church came to be patronized by the State the Christian was enmeshed in the usages and customs, and the habits and amusements of pagan society. To St. Hippolytus, for example, the corporate life of the Fellowship comprised within its span all the activities of its members: social, recreational, and "community" life, philanthropic, educational, intellectual, and spiritual interests were all centred in and directed by the Church. His contemporary, St. Clement of Alexandria, writes thus on *laughter*: "Whatever things are natural to man we must not eradicate, but rather place upon them proper terms and convenient seasons." "One must not be gloomy, but only grave. Even smiling requires to be made a subject of discipline" (*Pædagogos*, ii. 45, 47; for this same mood and temper more than a century later, *cf.* Lowther Clarke, *Ascetic Discourses of St. Basil*, pp. 180-182, 241). St. John Chrysostom represents the late fourth century attitude of Eastern Christianity. By his time one had to look to the Religious for the maintenance and upholding of the early Catholic standard of life and Christian ideals. He would have the ordinary Christian revive in his own life the Christian way, by reference to monastic example: "All precepts of the Gospel are incumbent upon those in the world and common to these and monastics, save marriage" (*in Matt.* vii. 7—Migne, *PG.* lvii. 81), for the monastic ideal is only that of full Christianity (*in 1 Cor.* xxv. 3-4—*PG.* lxi. 208-212). When he writes of riches, he speaks with a disillusioned conviction as to their dangers: riches are in themselves "goods," but only "good" to those who use them aright (*in illud "ego Dominus Deus"* 3—*PG.* lvi. 147). As a matter of fact, riches are usually gained by immoral

methods, *e.g.* usury, the exploitation of the poor, and under the impulsion of avarice, and "the Church forbids Christians to amass riches" since they are only a trust to be administered for the poor and needy (*in Mt.* lvi. 5-6—*PG.* lviii. 556-557). Private gain is against public good, and the evils of social life are traceable to riches and pleasures; to fraud, deceit, and wrongful gain. The world and its wealth belong to all men. Hence it is wrong to retain what belongs to God and to enjoy *privately* what is really for all. "How can one who possesses riches become good? . . . Only by sharing them with others, by giving them up he can become good" (*in* 1 *Tim.* xii. 3-4—*PG.* lxii. 562-564). Men become truly wealthy by casting away riches as the sower his seed: "Let him who would become rich impoverish himself and become wealthy: let him spend to amass, dispense in order to receive" (*in Rom.* vii. 9—*PG.* lx. 454). On the primitive Christian Communism Chrysostom looks back with longing eyes: if his hearers had no fear, they would emulate the example of the first Christians. "So soon as the Apostles began to sow the word of piety they gained three thousand adherents—all of one heart and soul." The bond which united them was that all despised riches and gave away to gain (*cf.* Ermoni, *St. Jean Chrysostome*, Paris, 1911, p. 112). Chrysostom reprobates idleness . . . "which teaches evil and from the beginning has led astray all who have given themselves over to it" (*ad pop. Ant.* xxii. 1-2—*PG.* lix. 188; on poverty, *cf. in illud Salute "Priscillam et Aquillam,"* ii. 4—*PG.* li. 202). On property Ermoni sums up Chrysostom's views in a brief sentence: "The right of property is not the *jus utendi et abutendi* of the Roman lawyers" (*op. cit.*, p. 115; on earlier and contemporary views of property, *cf.* Schelling, *Reichtum und Eigentum in der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg, i. B., Herder, 1909).

The taint of heathenism and the seductions of anti-Christian corruption were latent in the amusements of the newly "converted" Christian world. The liberty which the Christian now came to enjoy was fraught with gravest dangers. Into the Church had crowded hordes of people whose conversion was as imperfect as their conception of the obligations of Christianity was inadequate. Wealth, pleasures, and the loss of primitive Christian simplicity constitute the objects of attack by the leaders of the Church. Over all of life—economic, social, recreational—lay a pagan pall; the stubborn opposition of the not-yet-Christian customs and *mores* often triumphed against the ideas and principles of the Church. St. Jerome advises St. Paulinus of Nola († 431) to have no part in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, where the "scenes of the Passion and Resurrection" are defiled by the presence of "prostitutes, play-

actors, and buffoons" (*Epist.* lviii. 4; in *PL.* xxii. 340; of the year 395). The theatre and Circus, all too often licentious and salacious, attracted crowds of supposed Christians. Honorius and Theodosius in 413 bound actresses to their trade "so that the usual provision for the pleasures of the people and for holidays be not lacking" (*Cod. Theod.* XV. xvii. 13). St. Augustine in Africa would seem to have made some headway against the *Lætitiæ*, and to have purged them in a measure from obscenities. Yet he urged his people "to repudiate such concessions to human infirmity" and prevailed upon them to renounce them (*Ep.* xxix. 9). By the middle of the fifth century, Salvian says roundly that "in public spectacles there is a kind of apostasy." "How can the baptized Christian attend them?" "What folly is it that we do not appreciate wit or humour save when it involve an affront to our Maker?" (*de gubernat. Dei VI.* 31, 22, 30; in *C.S.E.L.* viii. 133+). He goes on to assert that Christians despise the altars in paying honour to the theatre; that on feast days more Christians are at the Circus than in Church, and that men "leaving Christ on the altar, run to feed their eyes on unclean sights" (*ibid.*, vi. 37-38). Another African, the most famous of them all, makes shrewd comments upon the spiritual evils and seductions of the theatre. He speaks of his own youth, when "stage plays carried me away"; "What sort of compassion is this for feigned, and scenical passions? for the auditor is not called on to relieve but only to grieve" (*Confessions*, iii. 2; Pusey's translation, Dutton, 1909, p. 35). His sound insight into human nature revealed the psychological danger of artificially-stimulated emotion which has no expression in act.

A mood of disillusionment which came in the very early Middle Ages is shown by the conviction, soon to be established in theological and scientific texts, that while God willed the earth to be the common possession of all, by virtue as well of His bountiful gifts as man's labours, avarice had created property "rights" (so St. Ambrose, *de officiis*, i. 28; on Ps. 118, 8. 22; Ps. Ambr., *Comm. in* 2 *Cor.* ix. 9; St. Greg. the Great, *Liber Regulæ pastoralis*, iii. 21, etc.). While Nature—that is, God—gives common right of property, usurpation is the basis of private right. It is but a step to the Augustinian theory that property is the creation of a coercive State and a convention of the life of fallen humanity (*Tract. vi. in Joannis Evang.* 25). In the early Middle Ages it was strenuously affirmed that neither such conventions nor the *mores* of fallen human society might abrogate the claim of justice on the part of the needy, on the wealth of the prosperous (*cf.* A. J. Carlyle, "The Theory of Property in Medieval Theology," V, in *Property: Its Duties and*

Rights, p. 128 ff.). The sense that in the enjoyment as well of the bounties of God in nature as of the fruits of men's labour, there was an inalienable right of the necessitous to claim that which would satisfy his needs, is never lacking in the matured tradition of the doctrine of work and property in subsequent medieval thought. The claim of those who have need on those who have too much for their own need is grounded in immutable justice.

IV

The typical embodiment of the Catholic Doctrines of Work and Play is to be found in St. Thomas. The basis for manual labour is four-fold: first and foremost, to gain a living (*cf.* Gen. iii. 19, etc.); second, to avoid idleness "whence many evils arise" (*cf.* Ecclus. xxxiii. 28); third, to keep the body in subjection (*cf* 2 Cor. vi. 5); fourth, to make almsgiving possible (*cf.* Eph. iv. 28). To the first, St. Thomas adds that in proportion as the end is necessary, the means become necessary: it is, therefore, needful to have that by which to live, since it is needful to live. But if one may live without eating, he would not be bound to labour! Livelihoods may not be gained by illegitimate means (*cf.* Eph. iv. 28), and in order to avoid wrong conduct in securing the means to living, the Apostle enjoins labour (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 11). Similarly, loafing and busy-bodying idleness are reprobated, and their cure is work: "If a man will not work neither shall he eat" (2 Thess. iii. 10). "Manual labour" comprises every sort of legitimate work by which men may gain a livelihood. The second and third reasons for it he regards as secondary, since the end they have in view might well be secured by other means. Monastic regulations may sometimes specify manual labour (*cf.* St. Jerome in his letter to Rusticus, *Epist.* iv.) as did the Egyptian rule: Labour was "not only for the purpose of gaining the necessities of life, but also for the good of the soul, lest it wander off into evil thoughts."

The guiding principles governing his thought are two: the intrinsic terms of human life, grounded in the nature of things as they are and have become; and the conception of human life as essentially social, reaching its highest formulation in the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 17). Labour for Religious (and it is in this connection that the Angelic Doctor discusses the matter; "of the things that are seemly for Religious to do" is the subject of the question) is not primarily essential, though as a duty it be incumbent upon all mankind. There is, however, the intimation that, if one may live rightly without manual labour, he is not bound to it. To prevent theft (*cf.* Eph. iv. 28), coveting other men's goods

(1 Thess. iv. 11) and to avoid evil businesses (2 Thess. iii. 10) by which a living may be found, labour is the antidote. The second reference ("work with your own hands," etc.) is a precept of natural law—yet those who do not do manual labour do not necessarily sin, since natural law regards the good of the many. To secure this there may well be a division of function and an allotment of tasks. (St. Thomas' discussion may be found in the *Summa* II., II., q. 187, art. 3.)

His discussion of labour must be understood in the light of his conception of property. As Fr. Jarrett says, work was regarded as natural to man, and "sin did not introduce the cultivation of the soil, but it did introduce greed" (*Social Theories of the Midde Ages*, Boston, 1926, p. 122). According to Gratian the use of all things in the world *ought* to be common to all men (*Decretum*, *pars* II., *causa* xii., q. 1, II., § 1). Following St. Augustine, as we have seen, the Schoolmen held that private ownership belonged to the conventions of society, not to the inherent nature of things. The continuator of St. Thomas' *de regimine principium* looks back, as did St. John Chrysostom, to the primitive communism as the ideal for the perfect (Bartholomew of Lucca, *op. cit.*, IV. 4). St. Thomas himself distinguishes the *righ tto* property from the *use* of it: the former is legitimate and necessary (*a*) in order to stimulate the requisite diligence in labour, for a man will better work for that which is his own; (*b*) for the better ordering of human affairs; and (*c*) to the increase of peace, since quarrels more easily arise in disputing over shares in what is common (*Summa* II., II., q. 66, art. 2R; *cf.* also I., II., q. 94, art. 5, § 3). "The right to possess follows from our personality, but the method of the division of possessions . . . from experience of human life. This division is therefore not a sacred right" (Jarrett, *op. cit.*, p. 125). It is the good use to which man is able to put natural things which justifies his use of them. So far as concerns this use, while an owner may have private rights as to acquisition and distribution, he has not rights as to their use for himself alone: "A man ought not to hold exterior goods as exclusively as his own, but as common possessions to share with others in their need" (1 Tim. vi. 17, 18; *Summa* II., II., q. 66, art. 2r.). "Private rights cannot override the common right of mankind to the necessities of life" (Carlyle, in *Property*, p. 137; *cf. Summa* II., II., q. 32, arts. 5, 6, 7, etc.). In case of extreme necessity what becomes of private "rights" in property? St. Ambrose said: "It is the bread of the hungry which you are holding back, the clothing for the naked which you retain in store: that money which you bury in the earth is the ransom and redemption-sum of the unfortunate" (*Sermo* 64

de Temp.; also in *Decretum*, *dist.* 47, *cap.* "*sicut hi*"). Consequently, when there is a real need—plainly pressing and urgent—"a man may lawfully relieve his distress by means of others' property, and such action has no colour of theft or robbery" (II., II., q. 66, art. 7). This thought is, as we have seen, fundamental to early Christian belief—that the claims of the necessitous are of justice and right to be lodged on the abundance of those who have more than enough. St. Peter Damian therefore calls the rich not *possessores* but *dispensatores* (*Opusculum* 9), for, as the Canonists state, no man has rightly a claim to more than he actually needs (Gratian, *Decretum*, *dist.* 47, 8, 3, 5, 42, 1 *pars* I.). In St. Thomas' teaching we have a good illustration of the influence of Aristotle's doctrine of society (see Carlyle, in *Property*, p. 135), and the abrogation of the Platonic conception: "St. Thomas and all the doctors of scholasticism reprobated the teaching of Plato, who favoured common ownership and individual use. Over and over again . . . the ideal was propounded and preached that there should be individual ownership and public use—*i.e.*, private possession concomitant with almsgiving on a very large scale" (Jarrett, *op. cit.*, p. 144). The ideal might be described in the following scheme: God *owns*, the King *possesses*, man *holds*, all can *use*—which summary is a comprehensive résumé of the whole compass of the Christian tradition from its Jewish background up through the philosophic system of medieval political, social, and economic science.

The same cycle of thought—amplified and developed—occurs in the writings of St. Antonino of Florence († 1459), whose great work *Summa Moralis* (4 vols., Verona, 1740) has been studied by Carl Ilgner (*Die volkswirtschaftlichen Ausschauungen Antonins von Florenz*, Paderborn, 1904) and Fr. Jarrett (*S. Antonine and Medieval Economics*, London, 1914). To St. Antonino, all riches, whether natural (such as property, cattle, food and the like) or artificial (precious metals, clothing, money, etc.), come from God to aid us in our chief end—eternal life (I., VII., 3, 1, p. 533). God gives wealth so that men may look to Him as the Benefactor of our race, as the supreme object of our love, and in love may succour the needy children of God (II., I., 12, 1, p. 192). In accordance with the age-long tradition, he postulates what Bartlet describes as "the incomparable value of persons as compared with property" (in *Property*, p. 102), for "production is on account of man, not man of production" (Jarrett, *St. Antonino*, p. 59). Work has a direct bearing on man's eternal welfare, and is now doubly significant from both the natural and supernatural sides: the gaining of a living here, and the reference of all this life to eternal life (*cf.*

Jarrett, *Social Theories*, p. 156). Work has always been reckoned as holy, needful, and dignified. Jarrett illustrates this by reference to the story of the friar who would neither work nor beg (*Mirror of Perfection*, Dent ed., c. xxiv., p. 205; also the *Testamentum* of St. Francis, 5) and the charming story of *Our Lady's Tumbler* (London, 1909, p. 10; *op. cit.*, p. 157). According to St. Antonino, poverty is in itself not a good thing, and what are called "goods" really are *good*, since they were ordained by God for man's use (I., 13, 2, ix., p. 668; IV., 12, 3, p. 622). Possessions dispose the soul to contentment, but avarice and cupidity foil the very purpose of work and the goods of this world: the "goods" of this world can be turned to evil use when "evilly acquired, evilly distributed, or evilly consumed" (II., 1, 12, i., p. 192; IV., 14, 2, p. 735; Jarrett, *St. Antonino*, p. 60). Work is man's "duty, his perfection, and his happiness" (*ibid.*, p. 61). While man worked before the Fall only "for the pleasurable stimulus it gave the mind . . . after the expulsion from Paradise it became for the majority of men a stern necessity. . . .' The object of gain is that by its means man may provide for himself and others according to their state. The object of providing for himself and others is that they may be able to live virtuously. The object of virtuous life is the attainment of everlasting glory'" (I., 1, 3, iii., p. 34; Jarrett, *ibid.*, p. 61).

Turning from the consideration of the Catholic doctrine of Work to that of Play, we find a notable change in the mood and temper of the Catholic outlook. It coincides with the period which roughly marks the altered condition of the relation between the Church and the world. The taint of paganism had lain long over the amusements of men. If man's work had an eternal reference, so had his play. If all his activities were to be adjudged *sub specie æternitatis*, then a totally new orientation needed to be found: as His Father worketh hitherto so our Lord worked (St. John v. 17), and labour attains a dignity and significance which had been completely lost in the degradation of paganism. Inasmuch as by virtue of His Redemption man is now reconciled to God, a new psychological principle of play could become operative. Precisely because of his deep grounding in the serious things of life, and precisely by reason of the serenity which can only come from facing and solving the fundamental questions of philosophy and theology—as to God, man, creation, sin, salvation, and the last things—Christians can rightly be light-hearted and joyous with a happiness not of the surface only, but with an abounding joy deriving from the optimism due to the conquest of the hideous and ghastly fears of men—of fate, eternal recurrence, the fatality of circumstance, etc. Whereas a pagan resorted to pleasure as to a drug and

anodyne dulling the ugly and gnawing horrors of life's mysteries, the Christian, essentially serious, could give rein to a light-hearted gaiety which could not but shock the heathen as flippant and as almost temerariously sacrilegious. While the pagan's joys must be unrestrained in order to exist at all, the Christian's must needs be disciplined by reason of the very ebullient power which bubbled up within him. No pagan, for example, could be so flippant and careless of himself as, for example, St. Basil. No heathen could be so at home with eternal verities—through the mystery of the Cross and Passion—and consequently so gay as to all things else.

So much, then, for the fundamental temper. In the concrete, however, the institutions of recreational activity—the theatre, Circus, games, and other amusements—were as yet uncleansed and unpurged. In the earlier pages of his *St. Francis*, Chesterton felicitously describes the pall of corruption and defilement which hung over both nature and amusements in early Christian days. If men's souls stood in need of regeneration, how much more their social and recreational activities. A new motive and orientation could not of themselves suffice: there must be much purging and cleansing before the inherited forms of recreation and amusement could be accepted and approved by Christianity. Even in the early fifth century the austere tradition of the ideal Bishop precluded what would seem to us innocent recreations. Synesius of Ptolemais († 413) writes four years before his death that he had divided his time between amusements and study. He speaks with regret of having to forego his hunting, for the Bishop . . . "must be godly and therefore, like God, have nothing to do with amusement" (*Epist.* 105, in Migne, *PG* 66, 1481 ff.). The sinister quality of much of the recreations and amusements of a world not as yet thoroughly Christian is luridly shown in the writings, for example, of St. Jerome and Augustine. With all allowance for a certain acerbity of temper and rigour of judgment, their verdict on contemporary recreations must have been grounded in sad experience (*cf.* for the former, *Epist.* 58 in Migne *PL* 22, 340; for the latter, *Epist.* 29). Salvian, writing in the middle of the fifth century, denounces, as we have seen, the public shows, circus-performances and theatres as "deadly sports," "unclean sights," etc. (*A Treatise of God's Government*, London, 1700, pp. 172-173). Yet Apollinaris Sidonius (*cir.* 465) describes how in Gaul ball-games, dicing, books, foot-races and other amusements were apparently accepted ways for Christians to wile away the time—even in the period before Mass (*cf. Epist.* ii. 9; v. 17, 6—in *PL* 58, 483 ff.).

In the *Summa* (I., II., q. 31) St. Thomas discusses "delight"

or "pleasure." He distinguishes an active and a passive quality in pleasure (which is a "certain repose of the appetite," art. 1). "Joy" is the pleasure of the rational order; "pleasure" more narrowly applies to the physical level (art. 3). Of the former—peculiar to man—the seat is in the intellectual appetite or will (art. 4), and this type (intellectual pleasure) is greater than the delights of sense. Despite this fact, bodily pleasures are none the less more vehement, for the three reasons, that (*a*) things of sense are more known than those of the intellect; (*b*) sensible pleasures entail a physical concomitant; and (*c*) bodily pleasures are sought as antidotes of bodily discomforts and ills—hence more sensible satisfactions arise than from "spiritual pleasures which have no contrary griefs" (art. 5). All pleasure ensues upon some activity (q. 32, art. 1), and *change* is a constituent of pleasure in a finite creature: attainment, enjoyment, and satiation constitute the sequence of the process of pleasure-seeking (art. 2). Of the dangers of pleasure (q. 33, art. 3) he has much to say: bodily pleasures may hinder the reason by *distraction* (since attention may only be directed to one object and the clamorous claims of the pleasurable may be more insistent than the appeal of reason), by *contrariety* (since pleasures in excess are against reason), and by *impediment* (when the bodily alteration as concomitant of the pleasure serves to distort the attractive power of the appetite). Finally, "pleasure makes activity perfect" since it achieves repose of the appetite and stimulates attention to the matter in hand (*ibid.*, art. 4). Of the ethical quality of pleasure the Angelic Doctor writes: "There is a morally good pleasure in either the higher or lower appetite reposing in what is in agreement with reason. . . . Further, since the desires of good activities are good, and of evil activities evil, so much the more are the pleasures of good activities, good, and those of evil activities, evil" (I., II., q. 34, art. 1).

Having thus a basis in nature and reason for pleasure, he decides that "so to shun delight as to omit what is necessary for the maintenance of nature" (since "whatever is contrary to the natural order is vicious") is to sin, and such a sin belongs to the vice of insensibility. "The good of reason cannot be in man, if he abstains from all pleasures" (II., II., q. 142, art. 1, and *ibid.*, art. 2). Sloth, for example, is one instance of the sin of insensibility, in so far as it is a moral failure to exercise an awareness of true values. Sloth is a "heaviness and sadness that so oppresses the mind of man as to inhibit any action." It brings with it also a "disgust of work." It is a mental torpor paralyzing initiative. St. John Damascus describes it as a species of sadness (*de fide orthod.*, ii. 14). St. Thomas

acutely distinguishes this inhibitory and crippling inertia from true humility. The former—allegedly that described by Cassian (*Inst.*, X., ii. 1)—does not derive from true humility, which is the consideration of one's defects, and in consequence absence of pride. It comes really from despising God's gifts and underrating them. "From such contempt of the good things one possesses from God, follows *sloth*," which is really ingratitude. The cramping effects of sloth, seen thus in an indisposition to any effort or work, inhibit and paralyse all the activities of man. Hence, "sloth is a mortal sin, since it is contrary to charity . . . the effect of which is joy in God; while sloth is a sadness with reference to spiritual good" (II., II., q. 35, art. 1, 3).

Under the Question regarding "modesty, so far as it has to do with the outward movements of the body" (=decorum; II., II., q. 168), comes up (art. 2) the topic "can there be any virtue in sports?" The answer is in the affirmative, and the specific virtue of play is *eutrapelia*. Three weighty objections against the possibility of there being a particular virtue for sport and play—two ballasted by a patristic and the third by Aristotle's authority—open the discussion: (1) St. Ambrose was strongly of the opinion that all sports, not only those in excess, were to be given up (*de offic.*, I., xxi. 11), and St. John Chrysostom (2) said definitely: "It is not God but the Devil who is the author of sports" (*Hom.* vi. in *St. Matt.*), and since a virtue *is* "that which God works in us without our aid" (*cf. Summa* I., II., q. 55, art. 4), it would seem that there could be no legitimate basis for sports and play. Furthermore (3) in his *Ethics* (x. 6) Aristotle says that sports have no further end in view; hence since virtue demands some further end towards which it be addressed (*Ethics* ii. 4), there can be none for amusements. But—since Aristotle specifies *eutrapelia* ("good cheer," "sprightliness," "jollity") as the particular virtue in sport (*Ethics*, iv. 8), and since St. Augustine urged that a man "spare himself, for it is a part of wisdom from time to time to rest the sharp edge ever tense for action" (*Musicæ*, II., end), it is a wise and virtuous disposition of life to give room for that which will relax the mind—namely, "absurd talk and acts."

The substance of his argument for play may be summarized as follows: Just as the body needs rest (since it cannot keep on incessantly at labour and stands in need of *refocillation*), so the soul—in direct proportion as it is given to intellectual activities of the loftier sort—demands relaxation. Body and soul are both included in the strain of intellectual effort. Fatigue is the greater when the mind is intent upon the higher intellectual activities. A "quieting of the mind" is therefore indicated as

necessary, and this consists in pleasure or delight (see I., II., q. 25, art. 2; and q. 31, art. 1, *ad* 2), which is secured by relaxation of the tension consequent upon mental effort. He tells the story (*Collationes Patrum*, iv. 21) of St. John the Evangelist, who asked a disciple to keep on shooting his bow. Finally the latter remonstrated, saying that if he continued, the bow would break. St. John then drew the moral: the mind of man would be broken were it never to be relieved of its tension. The words and acts in which the pleasure of the soul is sought are called sports or play (*ludicra vel jocosa*). They have a definite end in view—the relaxation of mental tension and the recreation of the soul. Three cautions are proffered: they must not consist of evil or harmful diversions; nor must the soul's inner gravity be totally lost, as St. Ambrose says: "Let us be on our guard lest when we would relax the mind, we also dissolve the whole harmonious life of virtuous operations" (*de. off.*, I., xx. 1). Thirdly, such recreational activities must be seemly and accord with the time, occasion, person, and place. Hence the virtue *eutrapelia* means the proper bearing of one's self, in the art of deriving licit and proper amusement and relaxation from such games and sports. This same rational quality—the moderation of virtue—serves also to restrain the person from over-indulgence in amusements, and hence belongs to proper and decorous behaviour.

The whole end of Play is to secure that refreshing delight by which the soul recovers its zest and keen edge, through the recreation and relaxation it affords (*ibid.*, *ad* 3). Of course, the play element can be overdone, for an excess of sports and amusements is sinful—sometimes only a venial, but at other times a mortal sin: too much preoccupation with them deflects the mind and heart from the essential activities of the spiritual life (art. 3, *ibid.*). But too little interest in play is also sinful: "Everything counter to reason in human affairs is vicious. But it is counter to reason for one to make himself a bore (*onerosum*) to others—for instance, when he neither does anything amusing nor allows others to obtain pleasure from amusements. . . . People who are thus deficient in the matter of play, say nothing funny themselves and also put a damper on others who are being absurd . . . such people are, therefore, vicious, and are called 'clownish bores' (*cf.* Aristotle, *Ethics*, iv. 8). It must, however, be remembered that play is useful to secure rest and pleasure, which are not sought for themselves but on account of the business of life; hence, a defect in the matter of play is not so vicious as an over-preoccupation with it" (art. 4). In short, inasmuch as "play is necessary for the carrying on of human life" (*ibid.*, art. 3 *ad* 3), it is not only

morally justifiable but even more, is an obligation incumbent on the Christian (St. Antonino's teaching is much like that of St. Thomas; *cf. Summa Moralis, pars.* III., 8, c. iv. 3).

The sanity, wholesomeness, and human quality of the Angelic Doctor's discussion of play are no less apparent than his strong sense of its place in the scheme of things spiritual. There seems to be little doubt that such teaching found a welcome among our Catholic forefathers of the Middle Ages. When once the inherited institutions dedicated to amusement and relaxation had been cleansed of their immoral and heathen connotations, the Catholic instincts of medieval Christendom seem to have prompted an exuberance of play-manifestations—in art, architecture, social pleasures, sports, games, literature, and all kindred activities—which easily went to the excess against which St. Thomas speaks. Spiritual things tend to be lost sight of in the propensity for play. The indictments of our ancestors' sports and amusements is a common feature of the moralist's and preacher's discourses during the Middle Ages. It has never been easy to keep the nice balance which is virtue, in the sense in which the scholastics understood it. Amusements and recreational activities ran riot: obscenity and coarseness were confounded with wit and humour; church pageants and spectacles always contained a comic relief—which gave rein to fantastic ebullitions of dubious wit; the *mores* and customs connected with fairs, festivals and certain holy days were far from being what Catholic ideals demanded. Hence, we have plenty of evidence for a puritan and ultra-ascetic temper in the moralist and preacher of the medieval period. The Religious Life put forth ever newer forms—the more ascetic and austere as the times were disturbed and conventions degenerated. In this light may we understand the facts collected by writers who possess an over-realistic zeal for the study of seamy sides of medieval life—*e.g.*, Lehmann in his *Parodie im Mittel-Alter* and the works of the distinguished Prof. Coulton.

In the latter's study of *Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation* (Cambridge, 1918), there is a mass of material relating to the amusements of the Middle Ages. Wykeham ordered that the "scholars and fellows . . . after dinner and supper" were "to make a decent tarrying in Hall for recreation's sake, with songs and other honest pastimes" (*King's College and Eton College Statutes*, ed. Heywood and Wright, 1850, p. 72). The same illustrious ecclesiastic forbade "dogs, dice, hazards, ball, and inordinate unlawful and unhonest sports, and especially all games which afford a cause or occasion for loss of coin, money, goods, or chattels" (*ibid.*, p. 83). Lydgate in *The Babees Book* (E. E. T. S. edition, p. 32) exhorts:

"Of honest myrthe late be thy daliannce;
Swere none othes, speke no ribawdrye."

The "Model Parish Priest" (St. Gilbert of Sempringham), according to his biographer, John Capgrave (1464; in E. E. T. S., vol. 140, 1910, pp. 67 ff.), taught the children committed to his care "to play in dew tyme, and here plays taute he that thei schuld be honest and mery with-outen clamour or grete noyse." He instructed his people likewise, who "used non insolent drynkyngis ne no longe sitting there, ne used not to renne to wrastilling, ber-baytingis and swech other onthrifty occupaciones." John Stow († 1603), in his description of the sports of medieval London, gives: cock-fighting, ball-playing, riding, jousting, water-battles (after Easter), dancing, animal-baiting and (in the winter), ice skating, and the like (Coulton, *op. cit.*, pp. 387 ff.). A certain William de Spalding, Canon of Sculdham, was killed in a football practice (1321—*ibid.*, p. 400). Jousting was forbidden by the Church in 1195. Most actors were looked upon as members of a morally doubtful profession, on account of their indecency, laziness, and the tendency to waste money on them, while jongleurs were exempt from this stricture (*ibid.*, pp. 401, 404).

A Dominican of the early thirteenth century, Stephen de Bourbon, was sure that the Devil was "the inventor, governor, and disposer of dances and dancers" (Coulton, *Life in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 1928, i., p. 90); so also Thomas of Chantempré, a contemporary, the author of a fourteenth century sermon on miracle plays (*Brit. Mus. Add.* 24202), and others denounce vigorously the contemporary amusements (*ibid.*, pp. 128-129; 191-2, 194). By the time of Lyons (1274) the Minister-General of the Dominicans, Humbert de Romans, asks for fewer holy days, and permission to work after Mass; there would thus be less sin, and "now the work-days are scarce enough for the poor to earn their daily bread" (Labbe-Mansi, *Concil.* xxiv., pp. 109-110). A certain dilute approval of dancing can be found in Angelus de Clavassio's *Summa Angelica* (*cf.* Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion*, i., pp. 532-533), and in *Dives and Pauper* there is also approval of "honest dances and plays done in good time" (Com. iii., c. 17, col. 3). The evidence from Lehmann and Fuchs' *Sittengeschichte* shows clearly the dangerous tendencies and appalling evils connected with the sports and amusements of Catholic Europe. Small wonder is it that, as in respect of the impulse of avarice so of excessive addiction to amusements, Churchmen took a strong line in their affirmations of principles obscured and their denunciations of practice grown corrupt.

The unruly propensities of men—in trade and business, as

well as in recreations and amusements—which had with difficulty been kept in control by the Church, found new release and freedom at the time of the Renaissance and Reformation. From the sixteenth century derive our particular problems of the present: How may we restore again to society, within and without the Church, the Catholic outlook on Work—in an industrial age, a capitalistic civilization, and an environing atmosphere saturated by conceptions, ideals, and motives not animated by Catholic Christianity? This prayer from Queen Elizabeth's *Primer* expresses a Catholic ideal of work and property, which is as foreign to the modern way of thinking as it is alien to its action:

"Thou, O Lord, providest enough for all men with Thy most liberal and bountiful Hand. But wherever Thy gifts are, in respect of Thy goodness and free favour, made free unto all men, we (through our haughtiness and niggardliness and distrust) do make them private and peculiar. Correct Thou the things which our iniquity hath put out of order; let Thy goodness supply that which our niggardliness hath plucked away" (quoted by Scott Holland, "Property and Personality," in *Property*, p. 189, footnote).

Again, how may we redeem Play, sport, recreation, and amusement, from the taint of professionalism and rigorous self-interest on the part of their purveyors to society, and from the overmastering preoccupation with it, or the too-little concern with Play, on the part of members of society? Redemption is wrought by Man for men. May He, the Incarnate Son of God, lead His members into better ways, enlighten and cheer us in the drabness of a world gone money- or pleasure-mad, and restore to us the true dignity, and beauty, and joy of Work and Play.

F. GAVIN.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By the death of Adolf von Harnack Christian theology loses one of it outstanding figures and most prolific workers. A master both of literary and of historical criticism, Harnack was never carried away by prevailing fashions; and the main results of his work on Christian origins were positive and stable. In doctrine his writings were of less value; the Liberal Protestantism in which he was nursed, and which was so marked a feature of his *What is Christianity?* was responsible for serious defects in his *History of Dogma*. But a great mind has passed away; and we can but pay reverent and grateful tribute to his memory.

CORRESPONDENCE

PRESBYTERIAN ORDERS

SIR,

It is only because some of the extraordinary statements made by Mr. Moss in your issue of this month are certain to do great harm to the cause of Reunion in Scotland that I venture to call the attention of your readers to them. I fear that Mr. Moss's acquaintance with the Presbyterian system is scanty. On p. 309 he tells us that the Presbyterian "ruling elder" is "ordained by the laying on of hands," and that he is "entrusted with the administration of the sacraments." These statements must strike every member of the Church of Scotland with consternation. There is absolutely no foundation for them either in the law or in the practice of the Church of Scotland. Moreover, it is not "a mistake to suppose that the Presbyterian elder is a layman." He is a layman, and never pretends to be anything else than a layman. Further, Mr. Moss tells us that the expression "preaching Presbyter is invariably used in the Westminster Confession." Allow me to say that the expression never once occurs in the Confession. Possibly he is thinking of "the Form of Church Government," but one who writes about Presbyterianism might be supposed to know the relevant documents. It will be new to all who know the accredited Presbyterian writers as well as the Standards of the Church of Scotland that Ordination "does not convey grace." I refrain in the interests of your space from saying more. I content myself, meanwhile, with the remark that the statement about the late Dr. Cooper on p. 310 is misleading. Dr. Cooper was perhaps the best known of our Scottish clergy who in recent years informed our Anglican friends as to the functions of the Presbyterian ministry, but to say that his views had "no support in the Presbyterian formularies" is ridiculously wrong. No doubt there may be those in the Church of Scotland who attach no value to Presbyterian orders, as there are those in the Church of England who attach no value to Anglican orders, but it is the official formularies that matter in both cases. Church of Scotland ministers are satisfied that they have good ground for maintaining the validity of their orders, just as the Anglican clergy are satisfied they have good ground against the denial of Rome.

I am, etc.,

J. CROMARTY SMITH.

NOTE

THE FOURTH ANGLO-RUSSIAN STUDENT CONFERENCE

From Friday, April 25, to Wednesday, April 30, there took place at High Leigh, Hertfordshire, the Fourth Anglo-Russian Student Conference, which was attended by well over a hundred members of the Anglican and Russian Orthodox Churches of both sexes and all ages. The first of these conferences, which are organized by the British Student Christian Movement in conjunction with the Russian Student Christian Movement in Paris, was held in January, 1927, and they have now become regular annual events. They are of particular interest and importance as representing the only organized attempts that have yet been made to bring together under the guidance of senior people in an atmosphere of devotion and study some of the younger members of the two communions, and it is therefore confidently to be expected that they will be of real value in bringing nearer the ultimate reunion of the two great non-papal episcopal churches.

It is extraordinarily difficult to give anything like an adequate impression of these conferences, for those features of them which remain most firmly in the minds of those taking part are of a kind which can only very imperfectly be put into words. It is undoubtedly true that the greatest results are achieved not in the sphere of theological discussion, but in the sharing of eucharistic worship and the formation of individual friendships, both of which are of enormous value in producing on both sides that burning desire for the restoration of the visible unity of Christendom without which the mere adjustment of theological differences cannot have any lasting effect. It is from the bringing together of members of the two communions in the spirit of brotherhood engendered by common worship and the sharing of devotional thought that the greatest hope lies of the ultimate healing of the wounds that still bleed in the visible Body of Christ.

It was with this in mind that the subject of "Holiness" was chosen for the present conference in distinction to the more dogmatic and theological subjects of "The Nature of the Kingdom of God," "The Interpretation of the Holy Scriptures," and "The Holy Eucharist," which had been discussed on previous occasions, as it was felt that a full interchange of views as to what holiness means to practising members of the two Churches would lead to a deep understanding of the essential spirit of Anglicanism and of Orthodoxy. Each day's work began with either a celebration of the Orthodox Liturgy or an English High Mass, and ended with either Evensong or Orthodox Vespers, and it was from this setting of worship that the whole conference took its form. The mornings were devoted to papers on some aspect of the subject from the Russian and from the English side, and, the afternoon being left free for conversation and recreation, the morning's subject was discussed after tea in groups. On the last morning, senior members of the Conference and group-leaders summed up results, and plans for the future were discussed.

After introductory papers on the Friday by Father T. Rees, C.R., and Professor Besobrasoff on Holiness in the Gospels, the subject was divided into three main parts. On Saturday Father S. Bulgakoff and the Bishop of Truro dealt with Holiness in Church tradition, on Monday

Canon C. P. S. Clarke and Professor G. Fedotoff dealt with Saints in the Anglican and Eastern Churches, and on Tuesday Father S. Tchetverikoff and Father Turner discussed the practical applications of Holiness. There were also, on Sunday, papers falling outside the formal scheme by Professor Florovsky and Professor N. Arseniew. One cannot in a short space appraise or compare individual papers; it is enough to say that they all provoked great interest and raised many points for discussion both privately and in the groups.

As regards the personnel of the younger members, the English delegation was almost entirely drawn from the Anglo-Catholic school, the theological colleges being prominently represented among the male element. The Russian delegation, which came mostly from Paris, contained very much more of what may be described as the permanent laity, and it is hoped that at the next conference the dates of University terms will allow the presence of a much larger number of Anglicans whose work lies outside the narrowly theological sphere.

Perhaps the externally most striking events of the Conference as compared with previous ones were the visits of an archbishop of each communion. The Metropolitan Eulogi came over from Paris for about half the whole time, while the Archbishop of Canterbury paid a flying visit on the Tuesday. It is quite impossible to express the feelings of joy and encouragement which these visits left; it is only to be hoped that they may again be possible on future occasions.

On lesser, but perhaps not less vivid, impressions one can only briefly touch. The haunting singing of the Russian Choir (who performed in Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, on the Sunday afternoon), the intimate conversations between those of different race, culture, and experience, and, above all, the coincidence this year of the Eastern with the Western Easter, which the brilliant sunshine and the green fields of Hertfordshire did so much to fill with the joy of the Resurrection, all helped to form an atmosphere of friendship to one another and of devotion to our Lord through the Church. The Fellowship of SS. Alban and Sergius, which by its regular prayer and its quarterly journal tries to keep alive the spirit of devotion and enthusiasm among members of the conferences throughout the whole year, seems to have definitely reached a stage when it may hope to be of real value in bringing nearer the fulfilment of Christ's prayer for His Church, that she may be one with Him as He is one with the Father.

E. L. MASCALL.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

Hebrews xii. 2: *ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τὴς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν.*

The usual interpretation of this passage is that Jesus Christ exhibited the perfect example of complete faith, far surpassing all those mentioned in chapter xi. I would suggest that richer meaning is to be found in the words *ἀρχηγός* and *τελειωτής*, and that they ought to be interpreted to mean that He was both the inspirer and gratifier of their hopeful faith. It was, as St. Peter wrote (1 Pet. i. 10, 11), "the spirit of Christ which was in the Fathers that gave them that sense of spiritual nostalgia which

could not rest in its search, but looked longingly and yet confidently for an infinite satisfaction." That "Father Abraham rejoiced" to view afar off the day of Christ, and the existence within him and others of the feeling of the "vanity" of earthly gratifications only intensified their certitude that God was teaching them by this means that not the best "things" could ever be the "promises" they greeted with such ardour. Jesus was *ἀρχηγός* of this; and in Him every soul that hungers and thirsts finds its *τελειωτής*, the realization of its deepest needs.

The Editor of THEOLOGY, to whom I communicated something on the above lines, kindly wrote in reply that this exegesis seems to have advantages over that of Westcott and Nairne. "It also appears to have strong lexical support—at least, so far as *ἀρχηγός* is concerned. Moulton-Milligan's note shows that in the papyri *ἀρχηγός* means *auctor* or 'founder' rather than 'leader'—*e.g.*, a prytanis is hailed by a crowd with the shout, *ἀρχηγὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν* =source of our blessings. In N.T. Acts v. 31 and Heb. ii. 10 seem to be neutral as between the two meanings; but Acts iii. 15 is obviously far better interpreted as 'Source of Life' than as 'Prince of Life.'"

As to *τελειωτής*, he is unable to give any examples. But considering the word *τελείωσις* in Luke i. 45—"There shall be a realization or actualizing of what has been foretold"—*τελειωτής* may well mean one who fulfils an expectation, who brings something to a full close with perfect gratification.

It is to be noted, of course, that the author writes that Jesus is the *auctor* and *consummator* of "the faith" in chapter xi., and not only of "our" faith, as A.V. and R.V.

Grimm-Thayer's Lexicon gives examples from "profane authors"—*ἀρχηγὸς τῶν πάντων* and *ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων*—both referring to God; and adds "*ἀρχηγός* and *αἴτιος* are often joined." So Hebrews ii. 10, *ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας*, and Hebrews v. 9, *αἴτιος σωτηρίας*.

Vulgate in all four occurrences in New Testament except one has *auctor* (*princeps* in Acts v. 31).

F. A. HEATON.

NOTE

The S.P.C.K. has been fortunate in securing the former Bishop of Southwell to write a little book (*About the Lambeth Conference*, by Bishop Heywood. 2s.) giving just the required blend of past history, present news, personalia, and topography that the layman needs. His breezy and well proportioned account will be invaluable to the clergy who wish to preach on the Conference.

REVIEWS

THE ATONEMENT IN HISTORY AND IN LIFE. A Volume of Essays. Edited by the Rev. L. W. Grensted, M.A., B.D. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CROSS. A Study of New Testament Teaching. By William E. Wilson, B.D. 10s. 6d.

These two volumes stand in very sharp contrast with one another. The former comes from the Liberal Evangelical school. Its avowed purpose is to show that Evangelicals who are definitely not "fundamentalist" in their attitude to Biblical criticism do not thereby lose the power of proclaiming that Gospel of objective atonement through the Cross of Christ to which it has been the special joy of Evangelicalism to bear witness. The other book comes from a member of the Society of Friends, a teacher in the Selly Oak Colleges. And what he has desired to do is to dislodge from the minds of all whom his words may reach the idea that the interpretation of the Atonement in terms of penal substitution has any real ground in New Testament teaching. But while it is the classical Protestant doctrine which he specially assails, he is opposed to every soteriology which is based upon belief in a Godward reference of the death of Christ. Mr. Wilson writes from the standpoint of which Dr. Rashdall was the most powerful modern representative. What the student of Dr. Rashdall will find new in Mr. Wilson is, first, the refusal to allow that St. Paul can rightly be claimed as a teacher of a doctrine of satisfaction or substitution; secondly, the linking up of a "Moral Influence" soteriology with the Quaker view of the supremely Christian ethic of non-resistance.

The composite volume is more notable as the pronouncement of members of an important school of thought than (on the whole) for the merits of the particular essays. *Lux Mundi* is the standing example of a composite whole which was remarkable in both respects. The present work seems to me competent rather than distinguished. But, in any case, a joint production could hardly hope to be satisfactory in connection with the doctrine of the Atonement. It is a doctrine which pre-eminently calls for that unified presentation which only a single mind can give. It is that sense of unity at every point which adds immensely to the impressiveness of the work of Dr. Moberly and of Dr. Forsyth.

However, if the book has not the kind of unity which only a single mind could have given it, it covers the ground very

thoroughly, though it is more likely to appeal to the student of the Bible and of Christian doctrine than to the metaphysician. Mr. Cross has an essay on "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," in which he traces the development of sacrificial notions in relation to changing ideas of God. It is unfortunate that as a result of one of the few omissions in the volume the bearing of this exposition upon the sacrificial language of the Epistle to the Hebrews is nowhere investigated. An older-fashioned Evangelical would be happier with the essay by Mr. R. S. Cripps which follows, though for the Old Testament disclosure of the truth of vicarious atonement he goes not to the sacrificial system but to Isaiah liii. Dr. Lukyn Williams's study of Atonement in Jewish literature over a period which ends in A.D. 200 is valuable in relation to the conception of an atoning Messiah of which he finds no trace. Büchler's extensive survey in *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century* suggests the same conclusion. The three articles dealing with the New Testament are by Dr. Tait, Dr. Dawson Walker, and Dr. W. H. Rigg. The last-named's study of the Johannine writings is one of the best pieces of work in the book. St. John's soteriology is as "objective" as St. Paul's, in the fundamental sense of that word, which is, as Dr. Dawson says in interpreting the word "transactional," that "Christ did something for us which had to be done, and which we could not do for ourselves." Four historical articles follow: Dr. Harold Smith writes of the Fathers, Dr. A. R. Whately of Anselm, Mr. V. J. K. Brook of the Reformers, and Mr. Essex of the later period. Much of this is well-trodden ground, but I would call attention to Mr. Brook's study of Luther's theology. He sees and states the difficulties in the penal theory, but he also sees where its strength lies, and understands its appeal. Mr. Essex would not have impaired the value of an attractive article had he abstained from the attempt to answer in propositional form the question "Why was the death of Christ necessary?" With the Archbishop of Armagh's contribution, "Atonement and the Problem of Evil," we come to what is not so much a doctrine of atonement as a preliminary thereto in an examination of the divine method of overcoming of evil by love. But it seems to me that Dr. d'Arcy presses the idea of the "Divine Adventure" and of the possibility of ultimate failure in a way which adds to whatever difficulties confront a rational Theism, and has little contact with the New Testament. And he does not do justice to those who cannot accept the notion of a suffering God when he implies that they regard God's attitude as one of "mere pity, mere sympathy." Mr. Grensted follows with an essay on "The Atonement in Personal

Experience," which, again, is concerned with something other than doctrine. It is the better for not overpressing any psychological standpoint, and by its restrained fervour and theological proportion helps the volume along a good deal. Mr. Shebbeare gives us an article followed by a sermon, both very characteristic of their author in their mingling of religion and philosophy, of evangelicalism and liberalism, of almost fierce emotion and the dry light of reason. The quotations from Barth will help towards a recognition of Barth's importance, but Mr. Shebbeare seems to regard Otto as more thoroughly irrational than is, I believe, the case. Mr. Shebbeare's own contribution to the doctrine is to draw out the idea of the defiling character of sin, and to suggest its neutralization through all that Calvary meant morally and emotionally. Finally, Mr. C. M. Chavasse, expounding "The preaching of the Cross," states the background of the penal theory in the doctrine of necessary retribution for sin more clearly than the theory itself; but, apart from that controversial issue, this article is an excellent conclusion to the book. Of the volume as a whole the main strength lies not on the theoretical side, but in its cumulative testimony to the fact of the Godward aspect of the work of Christ.

Mr. Wilson's examination of the New Testament evidence is probably the widest in range that has ever appeared in respect of the phraseology of atonement and of cognate subjects such as the wrath of God. He argues his case very thoroughly, and those who are unable to go beyond a "moral influence" theory of the atonement will welcome his book as a corroboration of the main lines of Rashdall's position.

But he does not satisfy me, either in his conception of his opponents' doctrine or in a good deal of his important exegesis. I think he makes out a good case for the view that "satisfaction" to God is not taught in the New Testament (I should regard it as a word of inference). But that there is no Godward reference of the work of Christ in the New Testament, that is, that the death of Christ involves no such alteration in the moral situation, consequent on sin, between God and man as results in a fresh attitude on the part of God in relation to man, he does not appear to have proved. He rejects too easily the notion of Christ's death as a propitiation which is both given by God and directed towards God. The wedge he tries to insert between natural and inevitable consequences of sin which he accepts, and any idea of retributive punishment by God which he denies, improves neither the rational nor the moral coherence of the world. As to the wrath of God, Mr. Wilson, in discussing the Pauline doctrine, presses an antithesis between

"natural consequences" and "God's punishment" in a way which simply ignores the possibility that, since the relation between sin and its consequences, external and internal, is part of God's ordering, the wrath of God may stand for an antecedent divine quality. Of his exegesis of key-passages I have only space to say that again and again it seems to me just possible but exceedingly improbable. To give one example: 2 Cor. v. 21 is not an easy verse, but to interpret "He made to be sin for us" as meaning that God put Christ into the environment of sin for us is to adopt a method of handling words which leaves them at the mercy of individual vagaries.

It is no pleasure to me to write adversely of a book into which so much labour has been put. Nor do I complain that Mr. Wilson, like the rest of us, has his bias. But I distrust a bias which sometimes leads to a less than just interpretation of the views of others, and more frequently to an exegesis which simplifies certain passages of the New Testament in a way that gives rise to the thought that if the meaning had been that which Mr. Wilson ascribes to them, it is difficult to see why they were not written quite differently.

J. K. MOZLEY.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THEOLOGY. An Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles. By the late W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 12s. 6d.

The late Dr. Griffith Thomas was a prominent Evangelical teacher, who held several important positions. He was Principal of Wycliffe Hall, and afterwards Professor of Systematic Theology at Wycliffe College, Toronto, where he died. The present volume is clearly based on lectures given to theological students on the Thirty-nine Articles. In the preface composed by himself, he tells us that "it represents the work of forty years from student days." It has been published by his friends as a memorial to its author, with but few verbal alterations. The committee of Canadian Churchmen who supervised the final editing agreed that, though it was written ten or fifteen years ago, the work had been done with such carefulness and fidelity that it should be presented to the public as it came from the pen of its author.

The form of the work is a running commentary on the Articles themselves, with great attention paid to the text and history of each Article. There is a short introduction, a history of the Articles, a conclusion dealing with their general interpretation, and an appendix largely concerned with matters of present controversy.

The book itself is a monument of learning. The author has read widely, and possessed a mind quick to select passages suitable for his argument. His style is lucid and forcible. Whether we agree with him or not, there is no doubt about his meaning. He has the gifts of a teacher. We may sometimes feel that his clearness comes from the fact that he is unable to see the attractiveness of any other point of view than his own, but at least there is a tone of conviction about his theological statements that is lacking in most modern Evangelical utterances. The greatest value of the book, to many minds, will be that it gives full and classical expression to the systematic beliefs of the older generation of Evangelicals. If we wish to learn what learned representatives of the old Evangelicalism preached and taught, and the arguments by which they defended their position, we cannot do better than read this book. It is necessary to add that it does not make easy reading. It demands close attention. Its whole method of treatment is that of the solid theological treatise of older generations, which makes it a valuable work of reference.

Granted certain presuppositions, the position adopted in this book is irrefutable. It is consistent with itself, and contains a real gospel. But unhappily it is just these presuppositions that are today being most widely repudiated, not only by Modernists and Anglo-Catholics, but by Evangelicals. It practically assumes that the New Testament, even if not verbally inspired, affords a series of theological statements which must be accepted as possessing scientific accuracy and completeness. The Bible is treated in a manner that ignores the truth that it is the occasional literature of a worshipping community, which presupposes the life and activity of that community. Dr. Griffith Thomas scarcely conceals his dislike and distrust of literary and historical criticism as applied to the Scriptures. He reluctantly admits of a limited application of criticism to the Old Testament, though he indulges in the strange statement that archæology has largely refuted the theories of the critics. But it does not appear that he has ever faced the results of the application of criticism to the New Testament. Nor does he consider the danger to faith that follows from ascribing to passages of the New Testament a doctrinal precision that they were never intended to possess. We are slowly awakening to the fact that the loss of the belief in an infallible Bible has ushered in for theology a new and critical era, but our students will get no help towards constructing a living theology from such a volume as this.

Nor, again, can we today ascribe to the Thirty-nine Articles the value ascribed to them in this book. In origin they were a

temporary expedient, devised with a studied ambiguity in order to include as many as possible within the limits of the Church during a period of uncertainty. Many of the controversies with which they are concerned have for the present day no meaning whatever. Dr. Thomas seems to regard them as the final decision of the English Church, to be accepted in the sense that he puts upon them, under penalty of being branded as disloyal. Instead of leading students away from barren and obsolete disputes, he seems to take a delight in emphasising points of difference. Most of us today would be willing to admit that there are a larger number of questions of theology than our forefathers supposed, about which Christians can loyally hold opposite opinions. For Dr. Thomas there were few such open questions. The Articles are capable only of a strictly Protestant interpretation. Any other interpretation is assailed in a manner that recalls a lawyer bent on securing the condemnation of a criminal rather than the impartial investigation of a student of theology.

In short, if this book is to be regarded as a text-book for theological students, we cannot but regard its employment for this purpose as other than deplorable. It assumes principles that can no longer be accepted. It fixes their attention on details of past controversy that a wider charity and ampler vision should be able to transcend. If the Church of England as a whole were to be committed to the outlook of this volume in the present age, it would rapidly shrivel into a timid and waspish sect.

E. J. BICKNELL.

NOTICES

THE ACCURACY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By J. Garrow Duncan, B.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The author of this work is well known as an archæologist and excavator, and especially for his careful investigation of the ancient fortifications of the old Jebusite citadel of Jerusalem, the circumstances of its capture by David and Joab, and the work of successive Kings of Israel and Judah on these fortifications. The author explained his main discoveries in this quarter in 1924 in an article "Millo and the city of David," with a useful plan by Macalister (*Z.A.W.*, 1924, Heft 3/4, pp. 222-44). This topic is thoroughly reviewed in the present work (chap. x.) under the headings: (*a*) The Little Hill of Zion, (*b*) Description of the City, (*c*) The Millo and Ophel, (*d*) The Fortress of Ophel, (*e*) Gihon and Bethesda, (*f*) The Stone Zoheleth, (*g*) Later Fortifications, (*h*) David's Capture of Jerusalem—the *Tsinnor*, with some excellent illustrations. Our limits do not permit a full discussion of these difficult questions, but

we have found this part of the book very interesting, and we shall not be surprised if many readers come to the conclusion that this chapter is the best part of the book.

But the book as a whole has a much wider scope. The author advances the view that many of the Old Testament narratives, which have for internal reasons been considered to be legendary rather than historical, may be established by the accuracy of their background as disclosed by archæology, and that this is specially important because the Israelites have left practically no inscriptions to confirm their traditions. "If a writer is painstakingly careful to place the events of his narrative in the correct setting of the period to which they are reputed to belong, there is at least a presumption that his narrative may also otherwise be accurate in detail, if not even a presumption that the original narrative was contemporary with the events" (p. xi). There is certainly some force in this proposition, but we find some difficulty in applying it to the early narratives in Genesis. Thus it is well known that there were Babylonian legends of the Deluge, and excavators at Ur came upon a stratum of alluvial deposit too deep to be explained by anything except a flood of great extent and considerable duration (p. 27). But we do not think Mr. Duncan would deduce from these facts that all the statements in Gen. vi. 5 to ix. 17 are historical. All that can be considered to be proved is that there was at some period a considerable inundation in Southern Babylonia. Again, the *massebah*, or sacred pillar of Canaanite worship, has been found at Gezer (*circa* 2500 B.C.), Taanach, Megiddo, and other places (p. 158), and this fact is brought into connection with the *massebah* which Jacob erected at Bethel after his heavenly vision (Gen. xxviii. 19). But it cannot be said that this has much bearing on the veracity of the whole narrative. All that can be asserted is that the narrator found the word in his sources, whether written or oral, and was familiar with the object itself. We feel, therefore, that while Mr. Duncan's position may be of value in what may be styled historic times, it is not likely to afford much help in elucidating early legendary matter.

A very interesting portion of this book (chap. vi.) is devoted to the enigmatical story in Gen. xiv., which Mr. Duncan treats as if it were proved throughout to be genuine history. Now, while we agree with many great critics (such as E. W. Budge and C. I. Gadd) that there is some background of real history behind this story, and while the historic character of the four eastern Kings has been fairly well attested by Babylonian records, we cannot fail to observe that these records contain no mention of the campaign itself or of Abraham or of the five Kings, and that the narrative itself raises many difficulties (see Driver, *Gen.*, p. 171). The proof of the authenticity of this narrative must in the last resort depend on the narrative itself.

We have named some points on which we do not entirely agree with Mr. Duncan, but they are not matters of archæology, on which he is always excellent. His chapter (xii.) on "The Influence of Canaanite Religion upon the Hebrews" is altogether admirable. We may specially mention his careful discussion of the "seraphim." The illustrations are very good, and we hope the book will have the success it deserves.

W. W. CANNON.

PRAYER. By Mario Puglisi. Translated by Bernard M. Allen, M.A., LL.D. The Macmillan Company. New York. 10s. 6d.

This book is an attempt to supply, from the standpoint of Liberal Christianity, a philosophical interpretation of Prayer.

The author begins badly. "Owing," he says, "to the effect of centuries of tradition, Western thought, in its speculations on the significance and value of prayer, has constantly insisted on limiting it almost exclusively to its ordinary etymological meaning of "request," and on determining its value solely by its objective results." Assuming Signor Puglisi to be right in attributing this unfortunate distortion to Western thought as a whole, he is certainly wrong in assigning its origin to "the effect of centuries of tradition," for the traditional Western term for prayer is not *precatio*—the ordinary etymological meaning of which is "request"—but *oratio*, the ordinary etymological meaning of which is "speech," and the classical definition of prayer is that of St. John of Damascus (attributed by our author to Origen), "the elevation of the soul to God." But our author is in active revolt against what he calls "the crabbed intolerance of traditionalism," and so can perhaps hardly be expected to trouble to understand it.

According to his own theory prayer is a function of the vital impulse which "acts from the depths of the irrational, like an organic prime mover directing every movement and development of all living beings." There is therefore no room for the supernatural or, indeed, any action of God upon man; and St. Augustine is criticized for his theology of such an incomprehensible fact as divine grace; while the Jewish *El* and the Christian *pneuma* and *charis* are merely equivalents of *mana*.

The experience of the numinous is the essential first step in prayer, described in one page not only as "the first note which the divine strikes on the strings of the soul," but also as a "secret temple" and a "mysterious star." This is followed by its opposite—rationalization, with which it is in continual conflict. Theology, according to this theory, is merely an attempt to rationalize the irrational, which probably accounts for the fact that the author's conception of the divine is so vague as to be almost meaningless.

After pursuing prayer through various other pairs of conflicting opposites, magical and religious, personal and institutional, passive and active, we arrive at his evaluation of types of prayer, of which our author distinguishes four in ascending order: Eudæmonistic, Æsthetic, Noetic and Ethical. *Eudæmonistic* prayer is a low and materialistic type, being merely request for material needs, and our author interprets what he calls "the Gospel words, 'ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you,'" in this rather unusual sense. *Æsthetic* prayer answers to the affective prayer of tradition, and *Noetic* to contemplation. All these are stigmatized as egoistic; the contemplative life, which is confounded with Quietism, is merely "a consecrated life of idleness and mysticism" and its asceticism "barren psycho-technics." The perfect prayer is *Ethical*, active co-operation with the divine for the sake of the community. Prayer thus becomes the instrument for the perfection of the soul for the benefit of Humanity (with a capital letter).

Signor Puglisi is a philanthropist in the ordinary etymological sense of that much-abused word; he yearns for the perfection of humanity as a whole, and realizes that such perfection can only come through heroic acceptance of suffering; but the prayer upon which he relies to accomplish

this result " finds its significance mainly in the part which it plays in the development of the life of the spirit and in the ends to which that life is directed "; it is " an increasingly effective instrument (and indeed the very process) of moral elevation." But prayer which is simply the uprush of the vital impulse towards the ideal can never attain this end; the love of man is the result, not the opposite, of the love of God who is Himself Love, and prayer which is merely the instrument of moral elevation is a very much smaller thing than the prayer of Christian spirituality.

F. P. HARTON.

HYMNS OF THE WESTERN CHURCH. Edited by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. Eric Partridge. 16s.

Scholars will welcome the Latin text of these twenty-four hymns of the Western Church with a verse rendering of each hymn, a brief introduction, commentary, and appendices. The work is beautifully printed and should stimulate still further the revival of interest in Latin hymnody.

H. M. RELTON.

PHILOSOPHY WITHOUT METAPHYSICS. Edmond Holmes. George Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

The thesis of this book is that the attempt to bring Ultimate Reality within the compass of intellect involves an initial misunderstanding of the Universe which disqualifies the metaphysician for the philosophic quest of wisdom, a task which demands the co-operation of all man's higher powers. Mr. Holmes is concerned to do something towards freeing Philosophy from bondage to Metaphysics. What is essential in Metaphysics is its reliance on " intellect," " reason," " pure thought," to solve the master-problems of Philosophy and all derivative problems by its own unaided effort, in entire disregard of the right of intuition to criticize and of experience to test its conclusions. Mr. Holmes, being an unrepentant intuitionist, is in open revolt, and gives us some vigorous chapters on philosophy without metaphysics in order to pave the way for a final chapter on intuitional philosophy, the creed of his own heart. This creed he sets forth in five short sentences, each of which is a paradox, for it is only in the language of paradox, he thinks, that an unformulated creed will allow itself to be formulated. (1) Becoming is of the essence of being. (2) Ideality is of the essence of reality. (3) Self-transcendence is of the essence of self-identity. (4) " Effort and expectation and desire " are of the essence of inward peace. (5) The " something evermore about to be " is the thing that really is.

Behind these articles of belief, Mr. Holmes tells us that there is a faith so large and so deep that it refuses to be limited by expression, and so sure of itself that it is well content to remain unexpressed. For

> " He is unknown to those who think they know,
> But known to those who know they know Him not."

With this paradox of paradoxes, philosophy, says Mr. Holmes, finally parts company with metaphysics.

H. M. RELTON.

MEDITATIONS OF A HERMIT. THE SPIRITUAL WRITINGS OF CHARLES DE FOUCAULD. Translated from the French by Charlotte Balfour. Preface by René Bazin. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

After writing the Life of Charles de Foucauld, the hermit of the Sahara, M. René Bazin collected and published most of his spiritual writings, consisting of letters, retreat notes, and meditations on the Gospels. De Foucauld's instructions with which he sought to convert the Moslem desert people have not been included, as M. Bazin does not consider them "suitable for modern French readers." This is a pity, as these writings might have formed the most interesting portion of the book, whose chief value is the illustration it provides of De Foucauld's inner life. The intrinsic value of the notes and meditations is not great. De Foucauld had no great intellectual training, nor had he a naturally rich mind. His greatness lies in his drastically complete response to his unusual vocation. *Per se* these spiritual writings are rather monotonous. With the exception of the letters they were not intended for the perusal of others, save, perhaps, the Abbé Huvelin, his director. To English readers it may seem strange that these inmost thoughts and feelings should have been noted down in such detail. But the devout French Catholic is from the beginning brought up to keep the strictest and most elaborate account of his inner life. The translation is good, but would have gained in dignity if in direct addresses to God the ordinary "You" had been replaced by "Thou," "Thee," etc. V. I. RUFFER.

SYNOPTISCHE STUDIEN. By W. Bussmann. I. ZUR GESCHICHTSQUELLE. 1925. M. 15. II. ZUR REDENQUELLE. 1929, M. 14. Halle Saale): Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

The first volume, though published in 1925, did not reach us till 1929. This big work is worth attention if only to warn us against accepting current hypotheses too readily. Dr. Bussmann's thesis is that a historical source, which he calls G, lay before the writer of the Third Gospel, who followed it closely, but combined it with other sources. It was worked over by a reviser with special interest in Galilee, and amplified considerably; at this stage it was used by "Matthew." It was then submitted to a final revision at Rome and became our Second Gospel. The author's first care is to disprove the argument that Luke at all costs avoided doublets. This he does successfully. The omission by Luke of Mark vi. 45 to viii. 26 cannot be explained satisfactorily except by its absence from Luke's copy of Mark. If this section was absent, probably much else was absent. The theory explains a good many things—*e.g.*, (1) Luke in the preface claims to go back to originals. Even had he known Mark, he would have preferred *Ur-Markus* if it was available. (2) The agreements of Matthew-Luke against Mark in treating Markan material number 100 or so in Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*—too large a number to be satisfactorily explained by coincidence. (3) The impression frequently formed that Luke's version of events is best—*e.g.*, in the Passion narrative—is corroborated. (4) That Matthew now follows Mark closely, now alters him considerably, is very perplexing on the current theory. (5) The apparently Johannine touches in Mark can be explained by Mark's being late in its Gospel form.

The question will be asked: What does Dr. Bussmann make of the picturesque details, names, numbers, etc., of Mark? These, it is said, were added at the last revision, to make a picturesque narrative; compare similar touches in John.

After developing his theory in broad outlines, the author goes through the Synoptic Gospels in detail and concludes by printing the original historical Source which may be assumed to have been at Luke's disposal. Much of the detailed argument is so unconvincing as to discredit the thesis. Everything is forced into the service of the theory. But when all deductions have been made, a case is made out which cannot be neglected. Nearly all scholars agree that certain phrases in Mark are late additions to the Synoptic tradition—"the gospel" (viii. 35, x. 29); "because ye are Christ's" (ix. 41); "with persecutions" (x. 30). A residuum of Matthew-Luke agreements as against Mark remains unexplained. If we allow the possibility of the "Mark" used by Matthew and Luke being not quite identical with our Second Gospel, we must be prepared to consider going rather further and widening the gap between the two editions. The aspiration *Requiescat Ur-Markus* was probably uttered prematurely.

The second volume deals with the Discourses-Source, usually called Q, but here called R. The problem to be solved is the relation of Matthew and Luke in giving the same material; now they are practically identical, now they differ widely. It is usual to reconstruct a common source, assuming on subjective grounds that Matthew and Luke altered it on this or that plan. Another theory is that both drew from a floating mass of material. Dr. Bussmann works out a theory of his own which has as much chance of being right as the other theories. There were two documents, R I and R II, which differed in characteristic words and in theological conceptions. One contained narrative and discourses, the other discourses only. In places the sources overlapped. Hence we get doublets and puzzling conflations. Luke followed his sources closely, Matthew edited them freely.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

MY HOPES AND FEARS FOR THE CHURCH. Murray. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Sheppard urges that the Bishops should throw down the barriers which prevent inter-communion, and declare war incompatible with Christianity. The Bishop of Middleton pleads for boldness in speaking out and for reunion of English-speaking Christians. Canon Storr desires new wine-skins for the new wine; the Dean of Manchester a spirit of aliveness, movement, and expectancy. The Dean of Chester urges "integration" as an end rather than "reunion." Canon Quick repeats in part his thoughtful article in *The Church Overseas* of April, 1929. Mr. F. R. Barry, in an essay written in May, 1929, and not brought up to date, diagnoses the situation. There are eight more contributors—M. Child, K. Ingram, J. C. Hardwick, J. K. Mozley, C. E. Raven, T. Guy Rogers, Dean Garfield Williams, E. S. Woods, and H. W. Fox. Their contributions have the weight which attaches to the names of sixteen deservedly respected clergymen and one leading layman. It is hateful to "crab" a book on which authors have taken trouble and a publisher has expended capital. But not enough trouble has been taken over this to make it a book of importance.

W. K. L. C.
E. G. S.

THE ALBIGENSIAN HERESY. Vol. II. By the Rev. H. J. Warner, B.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

In the former volume of his work, Mr. Warner enquired into the doctrines of the Albigensians and endeavoured to trace out their origins. He has now followed up this earlier enquiry by a description of the means employed to suppress what many have regarded not merely as a religious, but also as a social, heresy.

The treatment is divided into two parts. Part I. is concerned with the Crusade which Innocent III. launched against the heretics after the murder of his legate, Peter of Castelnau. More peaceable methods had previously been tried, and an army of preachers, including the famous Dominic, then only at the beginning of his career, had been let loose in Languedoc. But they failed to cope with the trouble. Part II. is smaller and deals with the permanent provision for dealing with heresy when its more dangerous manifestations had been suppressed by force of arms—the notorious Inquisition.

Mr. Warner has made use of a large number of authorities, and he has produced an interesting and reliable guide to the subject. The bibliography is, however, woefully inadequate, both in its contents and in the form in which it is printed. Some works are described fully, while others merely come in under a single word (*e.g.*, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, *etc.*, of Potthast appears simply as *Potthast*, a sufficient description in a footnote, but not in a bibliography).

The printing is not up to the high standard which one usually associates with S.P.C.K. productions, some of the misprints being quite absurd.

L. ELLIOTT BINNS.

ST PAUL'S EPHESIAN MINISTRY. By G. S. Duncan, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

In this original and exceptionally well written study an attempt is made to reconstruct the Apostle's three years, or rather more, at Ephesus. On three separate occasions he was taken into custody. During the first crisis he wrote Philippians; the movements there mentioned are far more intelligible if the place of writing was comparatively near Philippi. Before this imprisonment the mob cried *ad leones*, an incident to which St Paul refers in 1 Corinthians, written soon after—cf. xv. 32 "if, as men would have had it, I fought with beasts at Ephesus." The second crisis was that described in Acts xix., the Demetrius riot. During the imprisonment that followed Colossians and Philemon were written, and probably about this time Ephesians. The third crisis, perhaps at Laodicea, produced 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff. It is noteworthy that the persons mentioned recur in the Ephesian ministry of Acts. After this came the "sorrowful letter" to Corinth, and then, from Macedonia, 2 Corinthians with its many references to the events of the stirring three years. Dr. Duncan has little difficulty in proving that all the allusions of the Captivity Epistles, generally taken of Rome, can be made to fit Ephesus, and his monograph will long remain a standard work on the subject. The genuine Pauline fragments embedded in the Pastoral epistles it has long been recognised are mostly at home in Asia Minor if the hypothesis of a second Roman imprisonment is abandoned. Whether the probabilities urged by Dr. Duncan are sufficiently strong to outweigh the doubts raised is an open question. There seems something wrong when so many epistles

are put into a series of imprisonments which after all are not recorded in Acts and the *libera custodia* at Rome of which we learn in Acts xxviii is deprived of all literary remains. Perhaps the most striking result of the theory is the new view of the Church of Colossæ. Read Colossians again and ask what kind of converts these were who within a few months of the Gospels reaching them needed such a letter. But in any case they needed it some five or six years later. The theory here developed at least explains the "in prisons oft" of 2 Corinthians.

Having said so much to welcome the new theory, one must urge a grave objection. No one nowadays would press the doctrinal development of the Pauline Epistles in the way that the great nineteenth century scholars did. None the less, the general impression that the Captivity Epistles leave of belonging to a later stage of thought than the earlier ones remains strong. Dr. Duncan hardly deals with the authenticity of Ephesians, but though Colossians may be practically contemporary with 1 Corinthians, Ephesians can hardly be; the development in the conception of the Christian ministry probably excludes this.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

LECTURES IN HYDE PARK. Series III. "CHRISTIANITY AND CONDUCT." By Clement F. Rogers, M.A. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d.

Professor Rogers has done well to publish this new volume. It will be welcomed by many who have already found the two previous volumes useful. The criticism has lately been made that the Church of England contents itself with making known its views in *The Times*, and foolishly ignores more popular channels. One great merit of these volumes is that they represent the attempt to bring Christian teaching to the multitude. The presentation of Christian truth contained in them has stood the test not only of hecklers in the parks, but of the criticism of the university student. Some, no doubt, will consider some of Professor Rogers' positions old-fashioned, but they will have to admit that he can find good arguments to support them. Reason is never out of date. And parish clergy will get many useful hints for their dealings with individuals. We hope this volume will have a wide circulation.

E. J. BICKNELL.

DIVINE JUSTICE: A STUDY IN NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING. By V. J. K. Brook, M.A. 3s. 6d.

Canon Brook here reprints lectures delivered to groups of clergy. Their main object is a criticism of supposed traditional ideas about divine justice. Stress is laid on the love of God, and on the remedial value of punishment. The idea that the death of Christ was necessary for our forgiveness is repudiated. While much is said that is true and valuable, we cannot help wondering whether this familiar line of criticism has not been overdone. Granted certain presuppositions, almost any view can be extracted from the documents of the New Testament. In our present book we meet with far too many statements that need defence. Are we certain that the Prodigal Son would have been welcomed as he was, if he had not already had a hard time? (P. 27.) Is it true that in the early chapters of Acts the Cross is only an awkward fact to be explained? (P. 51.) Why, then, is Christ already identified with the Servant of

Jehovah ? The assumptions, philosophical and theological, which underlie this type of theology themselves need criticism, and that the present volume fails to supply.

E. J. BICKNELL.

IOANNIS SARESBERIENSIS EPISCOPI CARNOTENSIS METALOGICON. Libri IIII. Recognovit et Prolegomenis, Apparatu Critico, Commentario, Indicibus Instruxit Clemens C. I. Webb, A.M., L.L.D. Oxonii, E Typographeo Clarendoniano. MCMXXIX. 20s.

Professor Clement Webb's edition of the *Policraticus* of John of Salisbury, a monument of laborious and careful scholarship which appeared in 1909, is now followed, twenty years later, by an equally scholarly edition of the work hitherto known as the *Metalogicus*. Professor Webb has substituted the title which John himself gave to his work in the Prologue to its First Book, and henceforward it will be the *Metalogicon*. There is no need for too curious enquiry into its meaning, for twelfth-century authors were fond of giving Greek titles to their books or, as John's present editor wittily remarks, titles " quos Græcos esse voluerunt."

There is no subject on which mediæval scholars differ more than the determination of the period properly to be called scholastic. Some would carry back its origins into the ninth century with Scotus Erigena, while the majority are satisfied to date it from Anselm of Canterbury, " last of the Fathers and first of the Schoolmen." Bliemetzrieder, the learned editor of Anselm of Laon, has recently contended that scholastic theology begins with the ascription of a parallel and practically equal authority to the great masters of the schools with that formerly conceded to the Fathers alone. If this principle of delimitation be accepted, and it has the advantage of being founded on ascertainable fact rather than on the vague predilections of the individual historian, scholastic theology will date from the predominant influence of the school of Laon under Anselm and his brother Ralph at the beginning of the twelfth century.

Now it is true that John of Salisbury was hardly at all a theologian. He was at least, rather than a theologian, almost everything else that a twelfth-century scholar could be—humanist, philosopher, statesman. But it was just the extended interest in philosophic discussion that gave to twelfth-century theology its peculiar note and made it the needed preparation for the completed systematization of the thirteenth. And in the *Metalogicon* we have a vivid picture, not the less vivid because so entirely incidental, of the philosophical teaching of the twelfth-century schools. But we have more, for the Third and Fourth Books contain a careful account of the Organon, including the Analytics, and an intelligent estimate of their value. The constructive elements of the Aristotelian system furnished by the Physics, the Metaphysics, and the *De Animâ* were as yet unknown. Nor does John attempt a close and detailed commentary, after the manner of his great successors, even of those works which were known to him. He manifests throughout the mood of the almost detached observer rather than that of the partisan of a particular system. Of the question of Universals, for instance, he remarks with a touch of scornful humour that its discussion " had taken up more time than the Cæsars had occupied in conquering and governing the world." Yet he ranges himself definitely with Abelard in holding that they are *in rebus* rather than either *ante res* or *post res*. His account of

our mode of acquiring knowledge is thoroughly Aristotelian, save that he provides for no distinction between the *intellectus possibilis* and the *intellectus agens*. Again, if he denounces the opponents of logic as *scurræ philosophantium*, he is equally ready to enter his protest against its abuse when cultivated at the expense of those wider philosophical disciplines of which it is only the necessary instrument. In short, he reveals at every point the moderation, the common sense, the impatience of rigid system which have been always characteristic of his countrymen. It is, no doubt, one of the reasons for the interest which men of English race have evinced in a writer who can hardly be reckoned as one of the great intellectual figures of the twelfth century. But there are other and more prevailing reasons. John is an authority of the first rank for many and varied phases of the life of his time. He was a pioneer in the field of political theory. He was not ashamed to doubt where, to an independently enquiring mind, doubt seemed inevitable. Above all, he was a humanist, more of a humanist than any other of those who owed their intellectual training to that great school of the Humanities in the twelfth century, Chartres.

Professor Webb was the ideal editor of such a writer. His varied and massive learning added to the breadth of his philosophic interests and knowledge marked him out for the task. Of the *Policraticus* and the *Metalogicon* he has given us the definitive editions. Is it too much to hope that he may find time to complete his labours by editing the *Entheticus* and the *Letters* with the same thoroughness and skill which he has devoted to the admittedly more important works? But even if that should prove impossible, mediæval scholarship is permanently his debtor. The labour of producing an intelligible and trustworthy text, especially in the case of the *Metalogicon*, must have been enormous. The hitherto existing printed texts, four in number, were most defective, and even those four may be reduced to three, as Migne was content to reproduce the text of Dr. Giles's Oxford edition of 1848. But apart from his pious labour in establishing the text, Dr. Webb has made feasible an intelligent reading of the *Metalogicon* by his biographical and literary footnotes, which for combined adequacy and conciseness can surely have few rivals. Practically every quotation has been identified, even where the text does not give the name of the author, as in the case of the three quotations from the *Ecloga* of Theodulus on pp. 3, 64, 179.

An interesting feature of this volume is the list of additions and corrections, running to upwards of five pages, to the author's edition of the *Policraticus*. Even the greatest care in proof-reading cannot altogether provide against the persistence in a text of printer's errors. It ought to be an act of gratitude on the part of a reviewer to make a note of such errors of this kind as happen to catch his eye. May I offer my mite by calling attention to three slips which I have noticed? On p. xix, Rémi of Auxerre is given as one of the Latin authors quoted by John under the name Remigius Antissiodorensis. In the text ii. 4 (p. 66), the correct spelling, Autissiodorensis, is used. In the note on line 8, p. 18, the adjectival form of Luxeuil is wrongly spelled Luxoniensis, correctly Luxouiensis in the Prolegomena, p. xix. On the same page of the Prolegomena the reference to Roscelin of Compiègne ought to be ii. 17 (p. 92), not ii. 7.

A. L. LILLEY.

BOOK NOTES

South Africa from Within. By Rev. G. Callaway, S.S.J.E. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. The author has made a selection of the letters he received from a wise, discerning and sympathetic magistrate. They reveal one who loved the Africans, believed in their future, welcomed eagerly the beginning of an African culture, deplored racial antagonism, recognized that in the faith of Jesus lies the hope of the African.

The Eucharistic Month. Text and Translation. S.P.C.K. 2s. 6d. One of the manuals for the inner life. A book of devotions in Latin, interleaved with English translations, for the use of the daily Celebrant. It first appeared in Polenzo in 1737, and has been translated over and over again into many languages. It is equally suitable for the layman as for the priest. It is almost entirely composed of brief Scriptural quotations. Each of the thirty-one devotions is a study in the personality and the work of Christ—*e.g.*, Christ the King, the Fountain of Life, the True Bread, the Man of Sorrows.

Patteson of Melanesia. By F. H. L. Paton, B.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. General Smuts believes that the Pacific will be the centre of the world problem during the next fifty years. In a striking epilogue the author tersely summarizes the elements of that problem. In a brief opening chapter he deals with the lure of the Pacific which draws to its seas and its shores adventurous, heroic Christian pioneers, missionaries, explorers, traders. Among the company of the heroic he sets John Coleridge Patteson, whose life from boyhood to martyrdom forms all but the short beginning and end of the book. A well-told tale of a life full of faith, charm, adventure, and consecration.

A Reason for the Faith. By Ernest Evans, B.D. John Murray. 5s. Addressed to the young men and women of England. Not only does the author profess respect for those whom he addresses, but he manifests it by an exposition of the Christian faith based on the Scriptures, following the sequence of the creed, and requiring close attention on the part of the reader. He shows the unity and coherence of the Christian faith, its reasonableness, and the type of character which issues from it and from no other source.

H. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER